

The LIBRARY CHRONICLE

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

The Hero As Desperado	M. M. Crow	3
Jonathan Swift: A Bicentennial Exhibition	Autrey Nell Wiley	17
A Review of Reviews, Part II	Fannie E. Ratchford	21
Centennial of Statehood Documents:		
III. An Excerpt from the Memoirs of Francis Richard Lubbock		56
IV. A Letter from Anson Jones, President of the Republic of Texas, to Mrs. Mary Jones, February 19, 1846		57
Recent Books by the University Staff:		
Atwood and Whitaker, <i>Excidium Troiae</i>		60
<i>Between the Lines</i>		62
New Acquisitions: Latin American Collection, Rare Book Collections, Texas Collection, General		
	The Library Staff	63

VOL. II • SPRING 1946 • NO. 1



KNOWING I LOV'D MY BOOKS
HE FURNISH'D ME FROM
MINE OWN LIBRARY WITH
VOLUMES THAT I PRIZE
ABOVE MY DUKEDOM . . .
SHAKESPEARE · THE TEMPEST

The LIBRARY CHRONICLE

VOL. II

NO. 1

The Hero As Desperado

THE HERO AS DIVINITY, as prophet, as poet, as priest, as man of letters, as king,—so runs Carlyle's classification in his *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*. That Carlyle did not consider this classification exhaustive he indicates in his introduction to "The Hero as Poet": "Hero, Prophet, Poet,—many different names, in different times and places, do we give to great men. . . . The Hero can be Poet, Prophet, King, Priest or what you will, according to the kind of world he finds himself born into. . . . Given your Hero, is he to become Conqueror, King, Philosopher, Poet? It is an inexplicably complex controversial-calculation between the world and him."¹

Although the shapes that the hero might assume are diverse, startling is the proposal made by a Texas writer, a few years after the publication of Carlyle's book, that the hero might appear as desperado. "What a hand were Carlyle to paint the desperadoe of the backwoods, [whom] I for one deem a hero," writes Judge Alfred W. Arrington, with apparent sincerity, in his *Duelists and Duelling in the South-West*.² "The

¹*On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*, ed. J. C. Adams (New York, 1907), pp. 108-109; cf. B. H. Lehman, *Carlyle's Theory of the Hero* (Durham, 1928), pp. 58-59, 176.

²Published New York, 1847, by W. H. Graham, H. Long and brother; described on the title page as "the second and concluding part of *The Desperadoes of the South-West*, by Charles Summerfield of Texas" (Arrington's pen name). An advertisement of this book is reproduced on page 9 of this article.

For discovering and pointing out to me the Carlyle anecdote in Arrington's book and for aid in gathering the following biographical data concerning the author, I am indebted to Mrs. Marcelle Lively Hamer, assistant

passional organization of Carlyle," the Judge continues, "gives him a burning sympathy with the heroic in all its phases. His destructiveness is immense. And the feeling has stamped itself on the features of his face, giving even to his picture a half-scowling look of iron determination and defiance. . . . Thomas Carlyle is the desperadoe of literature."³

As proof of Carlyle's interest in the desperado, Arrington relates an anecdote of Carlyle, which, he states, "he heard from the lips of Theodore Parker himself" and which, so far as I am able to discover, appears in print nowhere else.⁴ "Some

librarian in the Texas Collection of the Mirabeau B. Lamar Library, The University of Texas. I am indebted for assistance in research also to Miss Winnie Allen, Archivist of the Library.

Alfred W. Arrington was born in Iredell county, North Carolina, in 1810, the son of a Methodist minister. The family moved to Arkansas, where at the age of eighteen Arrington began to preach. After some years spent as a Methodist circuit rider in Indiana and Illinois, he lost his faith and decided to take up law. He moved to Missouri and was admitted to the bar in 1835. In 1845 he moved to Texas, continued to practice law, and served as judge in the 12th (Rio Grande) District from 1850 to 1856. In 1857 he moved to Chicago, where, as lawyer and writer, he spent the last decade of his life. His writings, all of which may be found in the Texas Collection, include *Desperadoes of the South-West* (mentioned above); a novel entitled *The Rangers and Regulators of the Tanaha (A Tale of the Republic of Texas)*, New York, 1856; a volume of poems, collected and published after his death by his daughter, Leora A. Arrington. He died December 31, 1867. (See S. H. Dixon, *The Poets and Poetry of Texas* [Austin, 1885], pp. 22-26; C. W. Raines, *A Bibliography of Texas* [Austin, 1896]; L. W. Payne, *A Survey of Texas Literature* [New York, 1928], p. 14.)

³Arrington, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁴Theodore Parker spent a year (September, 1843, to September, 1844), traveling in Europe. His visit to Carlyle is recorded in biographies and correspondence of both Parker and Carlyle. On October 18, 1843, Parker wrote from Oxford to Dr. Francis, New England minister and scholar: "I have seen Carlyle twice, taken tea with him on Sunday night. . . . I shall have much to tell you some day." (John Weiss, *Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker* [New York, 1864], I, 223; H. S. Commager, *Theodore Parker* [Boston, 1936], pp. 93-94, 160.) On October 31, 1843, Carlyle wrote to Emerson: "There have been two friends of yours here in these very days: Dr. Russell, just returning from Paris; Mr. Parker, just bound thither. . . . Parker is a most hardy, compact, clever little fellow, full of decisive utterance, with humor and good humor; whom I

two years ago Theodore Parker, the eminent reformer of Boston," writes Arrington in 1847, "visited Carlyle at his residence in Europe. The *solitaire* plied the American with many questions relating to the peculiar conditions of our social existence on this side of the water, but manifested the greatest anxiety about the manners and customs prevalent in the backwoods. And when Mr. Parker drew for his amusement the portrait of the duelist, Bowie, from whom the deadliest blade ever fabricated out of steel takes its name,⁵ the eulogist of

like much." (*The Correspondence of Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1834-1872*, ed. Charles Eliot Norton [Boston, 1888], II, 43-44; cf. D. A. Wilson, *Carlyle* [London, 1925], XIII, 241.)

The visit of Parker to Carlyle in October, 1843, is evidently the one to which Arrington refers. It must have been at this time that Parker, "full of decisive utterance, with humor and good humor," told Carlyle "all the most thrilling anecdotes of the desperadoes of the West."

I find no reference in the Parker biographies to Arrington's visit with Parker. Arrington, according to Dixon, *op. cit.*, had a great passion for travel and might, of course, easily have visited Boston. He makes references in *Duelists and Duelling* not only to Parker but also to Emerson, Boston Common, etc. There is no reason to doubt that his account of the Carlyle-Parker conversation, as told him by Parker, is essentially accurate, although some allowance might be made for the exaggeration of Arrington's naturally florid style, which, to borrow his own words used in another connection, is as highly colored "as if a million wings of the rainbow had been wound into his pencil." (*Duelists and Duelling*, p. 43.)

For examining in the Boston Public Library and in Widener Memorial Library *The Collected Works of Theodore Parker* (London, 1863-1865), 12 vols., ed. by Frances Power Cobbe, and *The Works of Theodore Parker* (Boston, n.d.), 15 vols., ed. with index by Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Charles W. Wendte *et al.*, I am indebted to Dr. Edward G. Fletcher of The University of Texas. In neither one of these collections of Parker's works was any reference found to Arrington or to the anecdote concerning Carlyle. Dr. Fletcher examined also the Parker documents and papers in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society of Boston; among these original materials he found no reference to Arrington or to the anecdote. Apparently there is no source for the anecdote except Arrington's own statement in his *Duelists and Duelling in the South-West*, p. 5.

⁵See J. Frank Dobie, "Bowie and the Bowie Knife," *Southwest Review*, XVI (1931), 351-368; J. Frank Dobie, "The Knife That Was Law," *The New York Herald Tribune* (Magazine Section), August 2, 1931; E. G. Rohrbough, *James Bowie and the Bowie Knife*, unpublished M.A. thesis, The University of Texas, 1938 (bibliography, pp. 135-142).

Odin and Cromwell chuckled in an ecstasy of delighted wonder; rubbed his hands in a sort of savage glee; betrayed in his whole countenance, and in all his gestures, the intense interest he took in the strange narrative; and would not rest satisfied till the American had repeated all the most thrilling anecdotes of the desperadoes of the West."⁶

From this story the Judge concludes that Carlyle, had he been so fortunate as to visit the backwoods, would have closed his book on heroes otherwise than with "The Hero as King." "He would have presented as the latest form of hero-worship the hero as desperadoe. For beyond all controversy, and according to every rule of logic, the latter character is better entitled to the lofty appellation than was ever any king that swayed sceptre over chained slaves, from Nimrod to Napoleon Bonaparte."

Interesting as is the Carlyle-Parker anecdote and picturesque as is the language in which it is recounted, it probably has not convinced many that the "sage of Chelsea" would have enthroned the western desperado as a hero. "Why not?" demands Arrington. "What is a hero? I take it, the hero is one who dares danger—laughs at pain—challenges death himself in the lone duello without seconds; and would endure any extremity of torture sooner than cower at the feet of a mortal foe!"⁸ His definition of a hero he elaborates in a series of seven tall tales,⁹ in which he sets forth courage as the outstanding virtue of the frontier,—courage that is coupled with

⁶Arrington, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁸*Ibid.*

⁹The publisher, Wm. H. Graham of New York, avers in his preface that these tales are recounted with rigid accuracy. As witnesses of the incidents stated to have occurred in Texas he mentions, among others, Senators Rusk and Houston, and Mirabeau B. Lamar, ex-president of the Republic of Texas. Other well-known men are named as witnesses of incidents occurring elsewhere. As character references for Arrington the publisher names the Hon. Thomas M. Woodruff, ex-member of Congress; William C. Bryant, Horace Greeley, and Seba Smith, of the New York Press.

mighty strength and often carried to the point of reckless daring. With these qualities go a strong sense of fairness, a rude code of honor that makes the desperado champion of the under dog; a passionate love of wild liberty, an intense hatred of all authority and social distinctions; a proud, quick temper and a belief that vengeance is a sacred duty; a tinge of superstition; and an infinite fund of boisterous, savage humor.¹⁰

The first of the desperado-heroes in these tales is "Dare-Devil" Smith of Missouri, who, with a pistol in each hand, challenged and shot dead simultaneously "two costly robed gentlemen" who had dared to ridicule him. In another duel he stabbed with his bowie knife a young man in St. Louis who had "gazed with a look of vulgar wantonness" upon the face of his daughter. In a spirit of wild merriment he dared "the arch-millionaire of Missouri," who had insulted a poor mechanic, to leap over a precipice, in company with Smith, or suffer the humiliation of being horse-whipped.¹¹

Another narrative concerns Bob Potter, who was a famous Texas duelist, a captain who defended the frontier against the Indians and won high renown in the war against Mexico. He was a member of the convention that framed the constitution of the Lone Star Republic and was Secretary of the Texan Navy. His career as a desperado began in Carolina at the age of twenty-one, when he avenged in a way "too horrible to relate" the seduction of his young wife by "a presiding elder, of hitherto stainless reputation." After this unfortunate event he moved to Texas, where he led a life of adventure, ending

¹⁰Arrington, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-9.—Arrington's characterization of a hero should be compared and contrasted with that of Dixon Wecter in his chapter on heroes of the frontier in *The Hero in America* (New York, 1941), pp. 181-198. Much factual information on the subject is presented also by W. R. Hogan in his article "Rampant Individualism in the Republic of Texas," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, XLIV (1941), 454-480.

¹¹Arrington, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-14.

his career of desperadoism as he had begun it, fighting to avenge an injured woman.¹²

John ("Horse Ears") Wilson, speaker of the house of representatives in the legislature of Arkansas, distinguished himself in a duel during the session of 1836 by disemboweling with one thrust of his bowie a political opponent who, he fancied, had insulted him. "Another thrust aimed at the neck of his foe cut in two the main artery and the blood spouted out in a crimson fountain, with a gurgling sound, staining the robes and even the faces of several members with its warm, spattering shower!"¹³

A fourth tale concerns an unnamed Mississippian (later a San Antonian), a "sylph-like" youth—pale, graceful, golden-haired, with eyes "blue as the tints of a Southern sky one hour after the rising of the sun of early spring, when not a single wreath of cloud dimples the pure serene." This poetic youth in 1834 fought a duel with bowie knives and daggers in a pitch-dark room in order to avenge the death of his father, killed sometime before by a Yankee named Moses Stevens.

¹²*Ibid.*, pp. 15-19.—Contrasting accounts of Potter and of his Texan arch-enemy, Wm. P. Rose, wealthy planter, may be found in V. M. Rose, *Some Historical Facts in Regard to the Settlement of Victoria, Texas* (Laredo, Texas, 1883), pp. 184-187; J. H. McLean, *Reminiscences* (Nashville and Dallas, 1918), pp. 15-21; Charles Dickens, *American Notes* (London, 1842), chap. xvii. The feud between Potter and Rose led to the former's untimely death in Caddo Lake in 1841. This incident is recounted by Dickens, who visited America and the Southwest the following year.

¹³Arrington, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-23. Cf. Theodore D. Weld, *American Slavery as It Is* (New York, 1839), pp. 188-190. Weld's account is taken from a newsstory appearing in the Knoxville (Tenn.) *Register* of July 4, 1838, which in turn is taken from the *Arkansas Gazette*. The newsstory, which is probably more nearly factual than Arrington's rhetorical recital, states that Col. John Wilson, speaker of the House of Representatives in the Arkansas legislature, having taken umbrage at words spoken in debate by Maj. Joseph J. Anthony, attacked Anthony during an intermission. Weapons were chairs and bowie knives. When Anthony lost his knife either by throwing it or by letting it slip from his hands accidentally, Wilson thrust his knife up to the hilt into Anthony's heart. The affray took place on December 14, 1837.

JUST PUBLISHED !
THE
DESPERADOES
OF THE
SOUTH - WEST .
 CONTAINING AN ACCOUNT OF
THE CANE-HILL MURDERS,
 TOGETHER WITH THE LIVES OF SEVERAL OF THE
MOST NOTORIOUS REGULATORS AND MODERATORS
 OF THAT REGION.
 BY CHARLES SUMMERFIELD



A Desperado of the South-West in full costume.

This is one of the most extraordinary books ever published. It contains the only account of the Desperadoes of the South-West ever written. Its details respecting the Regulators and Moderators are of the most thrilling character, while the narrative of the Cane-Hill Murders, and the trial and execution of the supposed murderers, absolutely surpass anything to be found in fiction.

[The work is splendidly illustrated.]

The cuts drawn by Matheson and engraved by Orr.

For specimen of the style, &c., see next page.

PRICE 15 CENTS.

[Please preserve this Circular till called for.]

When the seconds, after a stipulated time, opened the door of the room, "a hideous spectacle presented itself. There lay the gory trunk of Stevens, the head severed from the body, and placed as if in savage mockery on the breast of the dead—and there was sticking in the bloody right eye the fatal two-edged dagger, almost up to the silver hilt in the now soulless brain." At the close of this narrative Arrington exclaims, "What a noble heroism was here displayed only for the purpose of destruction! Search the annals of all time and you cannot find a more lofty daring. Never did the leaders of the mightiest armies . . . exhibit a truer courage."¹⁴

Other stories tell of duelists who allowed their left wrists to be lashed together before they fought with long knives, who tested their nerves by standing with pistols cocked for five minutes before the word to fire should be given, who allowed themselves to be locked up alone at the dead of night, armed with murderous weapons. We learn of desperadoes who had been taught from childhood to regard courage as the only virtue and revenge as the chief enjoyment of life, whose morality was comprised in a single precept, "Never let a man live to say he has insulted you," whose motto was, "While your foe lives, you are yourself either a fool or a coward."¹⁵

¹⁴Arrington, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-29.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 37, 49.—Other "desperado-heroes" included by Arrington in his book are Fent Noland, Elias Rector, Wharton Rector, William F. Pope, Willis S. Wallis, Nelson Orr, Joseph Lasater, and James Whitson, all Arkansas experts in the use of bowie knife and pistol.

Such biographical information as I present here concerning the heroes is drawn largely from Arrington's romantic and possibly biased accounts. Materials for documentary studies on the lives of some of the persons named (e.g., Potter and Rose) are available in the Archives Collection and in the Texas Collection of The University of Texas Library. Probably biographical data concerning the others could be found in the Arkansas, Missouri, and Mississippi archives collections. But presentation of these life stories must be deferred for the present.

Brave men these, but can we call them Carlylean heroes? To Arrington's "Why not?" the best answer is to set beside his definition of a hero a composite restatement of Carlyle's definitions—*definitions*, because "for the heroic quality we have no good name."¹⁶ "Sincerity, a deep, great, genuine sincerity, is the first characteristic of all men in any way heroic." The hero is an original man, in that he comes with an utterance "direct from the Inner Fact of things; he has a direct Insight and Belief"; he can discern "the inner heart of things and the harmony that dwells there"; he is a man of intellect, of understanding. The hero must be a leader, a teacher; he is "a revealer of what we are to do, of what we are to love"; he is a spiritual captain, "leading his people as under God's guidance, in the way wherein they are to go," especially through rough ways "of battle, confusion, and danger." He is a man of strength and power, who can get things done. He is a silent man, "silently thinking, silently working," not merely "the right good fighter" but also "the right good improver, discoverer, doer and worker in every kind." He is a man of courage: "The first duty for a man is that of subduing *Fear*; a man . . . thinks as a slave and a coward till he have got *Fear* under his feet; a man shall and must be valiant." Furthermore, the heroic man is simple, earnest, honest, true, loving, just, loyal, reverent, obedient to the power of his vision, worshipful "of the divine truth of things."¹⁷

It is mainly because of lack of leadership, lack of social consciousness, that Arrington's desperadoes fall far short of being Carlylean heroes. To be sure, some of the desperadoes were Robin Hoods of the frontier, aiding the weak and defenseless, but they carried on their warfare as individuals, not

¹⁶*Heroes and Hero-Worship*, p. 217.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 27, 30, 42, 44, 45, 62, 63, 73, 99, 111, 142, 149, 163, 164, 235, 249, 310. Cf. F. W. Roe, *Social Philosophy of Carlyle and Ruskin* (New York, 1921, 1936), pp. 95-100; Lehman, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-61; E. R. Bentley, "Modern Hero-Worship," *The Sewanee Review*, LII (1944), 444; E. R. Bentley, *A Century of Hero-Worship* (Philadelphia, 1944), pp. 31-32.

as "captains leading their people." Carlyle's theory requires not only the hero but also hero-worship from the world of men who follow him. The desperadoes as a class were not leaders, not "original" men, not seers, men of vision, improvers, discoverers, workers, men to be worshiped.

But would not the desperado's courage alone make him a hero? In his first lecture in *Heroes and Hero-Worship* Carlyle praises valor as the basis of all virtue. "A man shall and must be valiant. . . . Now and always, the completeness of his victory over fear will determine how much of a man he is."¹⁸ And Carlyle admires the fighting man: "Man is created to fight; he is perhaps best of all definable as a born soldier; his life is a battle and a march."¹⁹ Yet mere valor, mere fighting, are not enough. Even the battling Norse giants could not have lived by fighting alone. "The right good fighter was oftenest also . . . the right good worker in every kind; for true valor, different enough from ferocity, is the basis of all."²⁰ And again, "The tiger is not what we call valiant, only fierce and cruel." In my opinion the desperado's courage would have seemed to Carlyle mostly ferocity and savagery, his absence of fear due to "absence of thought or affection, the presence of hatred and stupid fury."²¹

Carlyle may have believed that man is created to fight, but not to fight duels. In the American edition of *Sartor Resartus*, published eleven years before Arrington's *Duelists and Duelling*, Carlyle writes: "With respect to Duels, indeed, I have my own ideas. . . . Two little visual Spectra of men, hovering with insecure enough cohesion in the midst of the Unfathom-

¹⁸*Heroes and Hero-Worship*, p. 44.

¹⁹*Past and Present*, ed. Julia Patton (New York, 1927), p. 198. Although *Past and Present* appeared in 1843, four years before *Duelists and Duelling*, Arrington seems to have had no knowledge of it.

²⁰*Heroes and Hero-Worship*, p. 45.

²¹*Ibid.*, p. 196.

able, and to dissolve therein, at any rate, very soon,—make pause at the distance of twelve paces asunder; whirl around; and simultaneously by the cunningest mechanism, explode one another into Dissolution; and offhand become Air and Non-extant! Deuce on it, the little spitfires!—Nay, I think . . . God must needs laugh outright . . . to see his wondrous Mannikins here below.”²² In *Past and Present*, published four years before Arrington wrote, Carlyle declares that “under the sky is no uglier spectacle than two men with clenched teeth and hell-fire eyes, hacking one another’s flesh; converting precious living bodies, and priceless living souls, into nameless masses of putrescence, useful only for turnip-manure.”²³ Describing one of his bravest desperado-duelists, Willis S. Wallis, Arrington writes, “His very lips were white with the foam of raging passions. His eyes were lurid red, and wild as those of a lunatic broken loose from the asylum.”²⁴ For all his bravery such a man as Wallis would have evoked Carlyle’s outspoken condemnation.

Certainly, however, the desperado was a man of force, of might. Would not Carlyle, for that, have classed him as a hero? Right means might, Carlyle writes in “The Hero as King.” “In all battles,” he adds in *Past and Present*, “if you await the issue, each fighter has prospered according to his right. His right and his might . . . were one and the same.” And again, “Mights do in the long-run, and forever will in this just universe in the long-run, mean Rights.” On the basis of these statements we could, overlooking one phrase, argue that the desperado’s might made right, and because of his might he was a hero. But as Carlyle finally takes the trouble to explain, his meaning is that only the just, the right, survives,

²²*Sartor Resartus*, ed. Clark S. Northup (New York, 1921), p. 165.

²³*Past and Present*, p. 197.

²⁴Arrington, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

and justice "will last with the world and longer."²⁵ Right in the long-run is always might.²⁶

Not even of the desperado's love of liberty and his hatred of authority and social distinctions would Carlyle have approved. "Liberty? The true liberty of a man consists in his finding out, or being forced to find out, the right path and to walk thereon. To learn, or to be taught, what work he actually is able for; and then by permission, persuasion, and even compulsion, to set about doing of the same! . . . If liberty be not that, I for one have small care about liberty." Obedience is an essential of the heroic temper. The average man must learn to distinguish true heroes and must reverence and obey them. Carlyle does not believe in social equality; he opposes democracy, "which means despair of finding any Heroes to govern" and which is "a level immensity of foolish small men."²⁷

The resemblance between Carlyle's heroes and the desperadoes of the West is slight. Yet Arrington's mistaken comparison is interesting as an early example of long-continued and widespread misinterpretation of Carlyle,—misinterpre-

²⁵*Heroes and Hero-Worship*, p. 283; *Past and Present*, pp. 13, 14, 198.

²⁶*Heroes and Hero-Worship*, pp. 273, 336; *Chartism* (London, 1869), pp. 133-142. Cf. J. A. Froude, *Life of Carlyle*, IV, 360; David Masson, *Carlyle* (London, 1885), pp. 70-103 (cited by C. F. Harrold and W. D. Templeman, *English Prose of the Victorian Era* [New York, 1938], p. 1562).

²⁷*Heroes and Hero-Worship*, pp. 281, 291; *Chartism*, pp. 144-146; *Past and Present*, pp. 220, 224, 226, 227; *Latter-Day Pamphlets* (New York, 1903), pp. 40-41, 251, 274. See also Emery Neff, *Carlyle and Mill* (New York, 1924), pp. 230-231; Irene P. McKeegan, "Carlyle, Hitler, and Emerson," *University of Colorado Studies in the Humanities*, II (1943), 2-16; B. E. Lippincott, *Victorian Critics of Democracy* (Minneapolis, 1938), pp. 6-53; J. Salwyn Schapiro, "Thomas Carlyle, Prophet of Fascism," *The Journal of Modern History*, XVII (1945), 97-115.

For the opposing point of view—which attempts to show that Carlyle, though certainly not an ardent democrat, would have been somewhat sympathetic with twentieth century concepts of democracy,—see W. M. Morgan, "Carlyle's Concept of Democracy," *University of Wisconsin Summaries of Doctoral Dissertations*, VIII (1944), 205-6.

tation for which he himself is partly responsible.²⁸ In the first lecture in *Heroes and Hero-Worship* Carlyle has all praise for the wild, bloody Norseman, "who thought it a shame and a misery not to die in battle," and in his last lecture he commends his major hero, Cromwell, as a wild, rude, savagely sincere warrior-leader, forced to engage in war—"horrid internecine fight, man grappling with man in fire-eyed rage,—the *infernal* element in man called forth, to try it by that! *Do* that therefore; since that is the thing to be done."²⁹ And among Carlyle's minor heroes, says Masson, "the ordinary man could see nothing but a representation of energy, and even of brutal energy."³⁰ His admiration of courage, of daring, is almost unlimited, and his admiration of strength, force, and might he carries, according to his critics, to the point of deification. If we compare Carlyle's fighting men with Arrington's fighting men we find in both this courage, this daring, this might.

For this reason I can well believe that Carlyle heard with delight the stories Theodore Parker told him of western desperadoes; yet in view of his insistence upon many nobler qualities than mere courage, daring, and might, Carlyle would never have classified the desperado as one of his heroes. A refutation of the Judge is, in the present day, scarcely worthwhile except as a means of reviewing some of the fine points of Carlyle's doctrines and of recalling an old dispute concerning their interpretation. Perhaps the Texan wrote with his tongue in his cheek anyway; surely some of his desperadoes, though possessed of certain heroic traits, seem to be presented as

²⁸Cf. Roe, *op. cit.*, p. 97: "For our [Carlylean] leader turns out to be, say the critics, a Nietzschean superman, a Hohenzollern drill-sergeant, a vulgar strong Hercules or brawny Titan."—He might have added, a desperado-duelist.

²⁹*Heroes and Hero-Worship*, pp. 44, 298-299; cf. H. J. C. Grierson, *Carlyle and Hitler* (Cambridge, 1933) pp. 50-51 (cited by McKeehan, *op. cit.*, p. 11).

³⁰Masson, *op. cit.*

travesties of Carlyle's heroes. But if in our time we condemn the desperado-heroes for their ferocity and lack of social consciousness, as Carlyle would have done, we must condemn also the Carlylean heroes for their denial of liberty and democracy. Whatever we think of Arrington's motives, we are forced to admit he has preserved for us some striking examples of that famous genre of Southwestern literature, the tall tale.

MARTIN MICHAEL CROW
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH

Jonathan Swift: A Bicentennial Exhibition

OCTOBER-DECEMBER, 1945

SEVERAL GREAT LIBRARIES have recently commemorated the bicentenary of Swift's death in distinguished exhibitions and publications which set the Dean apart from the major and minor authors with whose volumes his had stood back to back these two hundred years. Thus bringing forth into their exhibition rooms both the man and his works, the curators dispelled for the period of the exhibition, at least, the gloom that Swift spoke of when he wrote to Pope, 5 April 1729, saying a great library always made him sad, for there the best author was "as much squeezed, and as obscure as a porter at a coronation."

When he added his fictitious land of Brobdingnag as an appendage to the coast of North America, Swift did not dream that two hundred years after his death, far inland from the coast which he playfully amended, his *Gulliver's Travels* would lie open and on view in an exhibition room in the Rare Book Collections at The University of Texas. From 19 October to 31 December 1945, his works were exhibited in ten cases, showing his first publication, "An Ode to the Athenian Society," printed in the *Athenian Gazette*, 1691/2, later entitled the *Athenian Mercury* and found in the complete file in the Aitken Collection; the volumes of Sir William Temple's posthumous writings that he edited and published; his first separate publication in prose and his first and last contribution to the Whig party, a quarto pamphlet of 1701 entitled *A Discourse Of The Contests and Dissensions Between The Nobles and the Commons In Athens and Rome*; his first masterpiece,

A Tale Of A Tub, in the first five editions and four others brought out in London and Dublin during his lifetime; and the works that followed this triumph of 1704, continuing the career of Swift as the master of hoaxing, in the *Bickerstaff Papers*; the journalist, in the *Tatler*, the *Spectator*, and the *Examiner*; the brilliant political writer for the Tories, noted especially for his influential pamphlet, *The Conduct of the Allies*; the collaborator and employer of hack writers; the disappointed exile retired to Dublin as Dean of St. Patrick's, honored by the Irish for his *Drapier's Letters*; the enigmatic friend of two women, to one of whom he addressed the *Journal to Stella*, and to the other, *Cadenus and Vanessa*; the occasional poet and pamphleteer as long as he was able to write; and the master of satire who, according to Coleridge, wrote as though he were "wiser than his maker"—the author of *Gulliver's Travels*.

On view along with the printed works were two locks of Swift's hair, a brown lock from his youth and a white one from his last years, exhibited from Leigh Hunt's famous Collection of Locks of Hair in the Stark Collection. Likewise personal in its interest was the beautiful presentation copy of *A Complete Collection of Genteel And Ingenious Conversation* (1738), upon the flyleaf of which the Earl of Orrery wrote in ink: "Orrery, The Gift of the Author; 1737/8."

A survey of all the Swift exhibitions—in the University of Cambridge, Trinity College (Dublin), the Royal Irish Academy, the Grolier Club, Colby College, Goucher College, the Huntington Library, the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, and The University of Texas—must include, also, the books from Swift's library, his autograph manuscripts and annotations, and the manuscripts and annotations in other hands, contemporary and later, that were on view in 1945. Four unpublished pieces in Swift's autograph were shown: from Trinity College (Dublin), a letter, and from Lord Roths-

child's collection, exhibited in Cambridge—a fragment of Swift's Preface to Sir William Temple's Works, a letter, and marginalia in *The Life and Raigne of King Henry the Eighth*, by Lord Herbert of Cherbury. Of the annotated works at The University of Texas, some had associative interest, as for example, *Toland's Invitation to Dismal*, annotated by Bishop Percy, and Wordsworth's copy of *Gulliver's Travels*, with Coleridge's three-page criticism written in his hand on the back leaves. Two annotated copies of *Verses On The Death Of Dr. S—, D.S.P.D.*, the first and second Dublin editions, were made known for the first time in the Texas exhibition, only five others being known before 1945 in the Forster Collection, the Huntington Library, and Mr. Harold Williams's Collection.

This review was in the typewriter when a letter came from Swift's distinguished bibliographer, Dr. H. Teerink, now of 4 Hoofdstraat, Velp (G.), Holland, saying that although the town where he lived, Arnhem, was badly hit by the war and practically all his furniture burned or stolen, the greater part of his valuable Swift library is in safety. His indispensable *Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Jonathan Swift, D.D.* (1937) was cited throughout the catalogues of the Swift exhibitions: *A Catalogue of Printed Books and Manuscripts, By Jonathan Swift, D.D. Exhibited in the Old Schools in the University of Cambridge*, compiled by Mr. John Hayward in collaboration with Mr. Harold Williams, F.B.A., and printed at the University Press, Cambridge, 1945; *Catalogue of The Exhibition Held in the Library from October 19 to November 23, 1945, To Commemorate the Bicentenary of the Death of Jonathan Swift, by the Friends of the Library of Trinity College, Dublin*, printed at the University Press, by Ponsonby and Gibbs, 1945; and *Jonathan Swift (1667-1745), An Exhibition of Printed Books at The University of Texas, October 19-December 31*, published in 1945 from a gift fund established in memory of Walter Marion Manly III, who was

killed in action at Moncourt, France, November 9, 1944. The first edition of the *Bibliography* being now nearly sold out, Dr. Teerink plans a second, using new material already in his possession, and looks forward to news about unrecorded copies made known in the exhibitions of 1945. A presentation copy of the booklet which anticipated Dr. Teerink's extensive work is at The University of Texas: Stanley Lane-Poole's *Notes for a Bibliography of Swift* (1884), presented by the author to Leslie Stephen, Esq.

Viewed in the light of Dr. Teerink's *Bibliography* and the descriptions of the exhibitions, the Aitken, Wrenn, and Stark collections and the library of Professor R. H. Griffith lend distinction to the library of The University of Texas. Here are seventy-odd first editions, nine copies with manuscript annotations, several books valued for their associative interest and fine condition, an unrecorded Dublin first edition of a pamphlet entitled *A Proposal For An Act of Parliament, To pay off the Debt Of The Nation* (1732), *A Letter Of Thanks From My Lord W*****n To The Lord Bp of S. Asaph, In the Name of the Kit-Cat-Club* (1712), not seen by Dr. Teerink but known to him; *A Letter Of Advice To A Young Poet* (1721), of which G. A. Aitken's manuscript note says only two other copies were known to him in 1902—one in the Forster Collection and one in the Bodleian; *Cadenus and Vanessa* (1726), the first London edition, printed for J. Roberts, with the errata slip facing the blank verso of the title, this and Mr. Harold Williams's copy described in the Cambridge Catalogue being the only copies with the errata slip as yet known; and the Second Part of *Traulus* (1730), of which the only other copies recorded are in the National Library of Dublin, the British Museum, and, according to Mr. Williams, the Royal Irish Academy.

AUTREY NELL WILEY
THE TEXAS STATE COLLEGE
FOR WOMEN

A Review of Reviews

PART II

Editor's Note: This is the second and concluding part of "A Review of Reviews." Part I, which dealt with Carter and Pollard's *An Enquiry into the Nature of Certain Nineteenth Century Pamphlets*, appeared in Vol. I, No. 4 of the CHRONICLE.

•

A RECENT OFFER from a commercial clipping bureau indicates that I have seen but a fraction of the reviews of *Letters from Thomas J. Wise to John Henry Wrenn* (Knopf, 1944) appearing in this country and England. I assume however that the ones I have read pretty fairly represent the whole. Of these, all, with a few valuable exceptions, concentrate their attention on the introduction, "A Further Inquiry into the Guilt of Certain Nineteenth Century Forgers," ignoring or touching but lightly the letters themselves. They fix their attention, for the most part, as might be expected, on its challenge of *An Enquiry's* thesis that Thomas J. Wise encompassed in himself the entire guilt of the forgeries, planning, manufacturing and distributing them singlehanded and alone.

One distinct group, apparently taking color from Mr. John Carter's discussion in *The Atlantic Monthly* for February, 1945, repeat each other somewhat monotonously in condemning what they call my "consuming suspicion" and "prosecuting zeal," though, for the most part, admitting the evidence I submit. Overlooking or forgetting that Messrs. Carter and Pollard in announcing that a major crime had been committed, opened the field to all investigators, and that it is an investigator's duty to follow the evidence wherever it leads, they seem to

reason thus: '*An Enquiry* proves that a gigantic fraud operated with prodigious success for forty-six years, between 1888 and 1934, eating into the very heart of nineteenth century bibliography and the rare book trade. It indicts, tries, and convicts Thomas J. Wise as the one and only person criminally involved in the fraud. With such a verdict on record, only a meanly suspicious mind would break the perfect pattern it lays out. To question anyone besides Mr. Wise is ungenerous and unjust, whether it be the printers and the distributors of the forgeries or Mr. Wise's collaborators in private publishing who publicly sponsored the spurious pamphlets.'

Actually my "consuming suspicion" touches but five persons, one of them "coming clear" under careful examination. All are involved in some portion of the evidence submitted in *An Enquiry* to condemn Wise, though so well screened out in its presentation as to escape all but the specially informed reader.

First of all I venture to doubt the Enquirers' conviction (p. 150) that Herbert E. Gorfin, caught with a stock of the forgeries in his possession and having behind him a long record of selling them, "had not the slightest idea he was selling forgeries." Beside the arguments of realistic common sense against the probability of such long sustained, not to say impervious innocence, I offer documentary evidence (*Wise's Letters*, pp. 165-66, 210, 260) that Gorfin, as Wise's office boy and clerk, habitually employed techniques to cover his master's surreptitious rare book dealings that fall little short of the legal definition of forgery, and that he forged outright an authenticating provenance for one of the fraudulent pamphlets sold to Mr. Wrenn. His ignorance of the nature of the forgeries, if the Enquirers are right in their judgment, bespeaks dullness of mind rather than innocence or integrity.

Another of my accusations, "by implication," according to Mr. David Randall,¹ is against Richard Clay and Sons, who,

¹The New York Times Book Review, December 17, 1944.

the Enquirers prove, printed all the pamphlets on their black list. Actually this is a misreading of my statement. I do not, even by implication, accuse Clay's firm; I merely call attention to the absurdity of *An Enquiry's* statement (p. 65), "Nor is there any real reason to suppose that anyone in their [Clay's] employ was privy to the fraud." I actually wrote, "unless the work [printing the forgeries] was done by an individual worker who kept his activities hid from his responsible superior, it is incredible that the executives of Clay and Sons . . ." Not only does common realism argue the connivance of someone within the big printing house, but I had in mind, as I wrote, Mr. Carter's off-the-record statements to two friends of mine on separate occasions that Wise managed the printing of the forgeries through Clay's foreman. In *The Atlantic* he admits, "Some evidence of possible connivance we subsequently discovered for ourselves in respect of Clay's foreman, although it remains circumstantial."

Both Gorfin and Clay's foreman are "small fish," in the story of the forgery, too small to be of interest except as they indicate the forgers' *modus operandi*. The foreman, I have heard, died before the Enquiry was made, and Gorfin, taken red-handed, so to speak, gave the Enquirers so much essential information as justly to earn his reward.

Mr. Robert M. Smith² thinks that had I looked sufficiently into William Michael Rossetti's connection with the Shelley Society, I would not have brought him under examination. As a matter of fact I have long known all that Mr. Smith reveals of Rossetti's dissatisfaction with the management of the Shelley Society's finances, both his complaints in *Some Reminiscences* and in private letters; but I knew also, from a letter among the Wise-Wrenn papers, that he exerted himself to the utmost short of "actual mendacity"—his own words—to extricate Wise

²"More about the Wise Forgeries," in *The Publisher's Weekly*, December 23, 1944.

from the trouble he got himself into by an unauthorized printing of Shelley's letters to Elizabeth Hitchener, and there is his signature on the titlepage of Wise's copy of *Sister Helen* to be explained, to say nothing of Wise's statements that several of the forgeries he sold Wrenn came from Rossetti. All these and other suspicious circumstances are offset by the fact that he resisted pressure (*Wise's Letters*, p. 289), from H. Buxton Forman to give *Sister Helen* his blessing. It is quite plain, however, that he knew not only that *Sister Helen* and *Verses* are forgeries, but who were responsible for their existence and circulation. No thorough and fair investigation could overlook William Michael Rossetti.

My actual "accusations," therefore, boil down to two; one of them is now fully proven beyond the most stubborn doubt by the clearest and most definite document that has yet come to light bearing on the fraudulent fabrications, and the other is substantiated by a body of evidence—to be discussed later—which to say the least, raises it far above idle suspicion.

Mr. Carter, in *The Atlantic*, reproving my forthright statements, cited by contrast his own cautious—and suggestive—understatements, a technique he uses with consummate skill in building up in the reader's mind a conviction of Wise's guilt, while at the same time avoiding conflict with his country's stringent libel laws. He makes this startling assertion: "Mr. Graham Pollard and I did not, however . . . suggest in print that he [Wise] might actually have been himself the forger, in spite of our private conviction that he was." Whatever finely drawn definition of "suggest" Mr. Carter may have had in mind when he wrote this sentence, it would be difficult for anyone to read *An Enquiry* without receiving the twofold suggestion that the Enquirers believed Mr. Wise was the actual forger and were quite willing to have the reader also believe it. In *The Spectator* for May 21, 1937, immediately following Wise's death, Mr. Carter's implication of Wise's guilt as actual forger seems to go beyond "suggestion," so far even as out-

right statement *in print*, when he wrote, "Whether Wise was actually responsible for the production of the fakes was not at the time [of publication of *An Enquiry*] apparent. Opinions differed, though most people found it very difficult to suppose him innocent at least of participation. . . . At any rate he [Wise] has the unique honour of two separate niches in the bibliophile's Valhalla . . . the other next to (and well above) the notorious [forger] Ireland: both of them well and truly earned." To most readers this passage "suggests" pretty strongly that Wise "might actually have been himself the forger." The sentence, "Whether Wise was actually responsible for the production of the fakes was not at the time apparent," brings us to a basic misstatement that must again³ be corrected, before I speak further of my "accusations" against H. Buxton Forman.

In *Wise's Letters* (pp. 52-53) I print a letter from Frederick Page to Wise written very soon after the release of *An Enquiry*, reporting a visit, which he, acting as Wise's agent, paid to Messrs. Carter and Pollard. In restrained, clearcut, and concise terms it delivers an ultimatum to Wise. Reflecting to a painful degree Mr. Page's embarrassment—the Enquirers had shown him overwhelming evidence of Wise's guilt—it is not a pleasant letter, but it is a document of first importance and for that reason I decided, after careful consideration, to print it, having obtained Mr. Page's permission. Beside demonstrating Wise's guilt, it shows that Messrs. Carter and Pollard, when they published *An Enquiry*, had in their possession evidence sufficient to bring Mr. Wise into court, had they so wished, and, they were persuaded, to convict him of fraud and forgery. The letter explains, too, Mr. Wise's puzzling suppression of his promised defense in Charles F. Heartman's *American Book Collector*. It reads in part: "I have seen Carter and Pollard, and I am charged to tell you two things: very weightily charged

³For my correction and Mr. Carter's apology see *The Atlantic Monthly* for May, 1945.

indeed. . . . If you or I or M.B.F. [Maurice Buxton Forman], once again bring forward any suggestion of H.B.F.'s complicity in the forgeries, or name him as the source of the stock you sold to Gorfin, they will produce their proof of your guilt. . . . They say that though Clay's have indeed destroyed their ledgers before 1911, they can still produce a record of your account with them. . . . They would leave this vague enough to alarm you, or rather, warn you. . . . They are fully persuaded that they can prove a charge of fraud and forgery against you, and that they will abstain from doing so unless you force them. If you have not already sent off that article to America, you will do well to suppress it. . . ."

Mr. Carter in commenting on this letter in *The Atlantic* makes two points. First, he denies its main representation, writing, "Mr. Page took these warnings so much to heart and so little to head that he wrote Wise a letter . . . conveying some threats which we did not make and were in no position to have made. . . . Mr. Page revised his report. But a copy of its inaccurate predecessor was sent (by Mr. Wise) to this country, and further copies of it were circulated by the recipient. Miss Ratchford quotes it in full in her book and draws a number of misleading conclusions from it, although she was advised in 1935 of its inaccuracy." Reference to my files shows (1) that the letter in question (Page to Wise, July 20, 1934, quoted in *Wise's Letters*, pp. 52-3) was sent to this country, not by Mr. Wise, but by Mr. Carter's fellow Enquirer and collaborator, Mr. Graham Pollard, apparently for circulation. I myself know six persons to whom it was sent⁴—apparently at Mr. Pollard's request—under the assurance that it was a true report of Page's interview with Messrs. Carter and Pollard; (2) that I immediately (in October, 1934) informed Mr. Carter of the receipt of the Page letter and the source from which it came;

⁴Living in New York, California, Texas, and Oxford, England.

and (3) that late in November, 1944,⁵ I laid all this data before Mr. Carter in answer to his protest against my use of the letter—two months before the publication of his article in *The Atlantic*. Neither does the Page letter which I print agree in any detail with Mr. Carter's description of the first and inaccurate letter. It is not full of "the wildest exaggerations,"⁶ rather, it is calm, judicial, restrained; and it does not represent the Enquirers as "pro-Gorfin and pro-Forman."⁷ I have also seen a letter written by Mr. Pollard in which he remarks that this Page letter had its effect in silencing Wise. Mr. Carter's understanding "that Wise sent one [a copy of the 'inaccurate' letter] to Gabriel Wells, and also perhaps to Heartman in connection with the suppression of his *apologia*," seems to be in error, for answers to my inquiries indicate that neither Mr. Wells nor Mr. Heartman received such a letter, and Wise himself, far from openly circulating the Page letter, when questioned about it, denied knowledge of its existence, writing, "What has greatly surprised me is your reference to a supposed letter addressed by Mr. Page to me. I never read or even saw such a letter. It certainly did not arrive here."

Second, Mr. Carter justifies the Enquirers' pressure upon Wise and Maurice Buxton Forman to suppress any statement involving H. Buxton Forman by saying that they were "only concerned to prevent Mr. Page from assisting Wise to throw the blame, *without citing any evidence*, on one man who was dead and could not defend himself. . . ." As a matter of record, Mr. Wise had cited evidence, very striking evidence indeed, however one reads it, to support his statement that he had his two copies of *Sonnets* and the stock of forgeries that he sold Gorfin from Forman, no less evidence than two confirming letters from Forman's son.⁸ Whether the younger For-

⁵Mr. Carter had copies of *Wise's Letters* in proof, and began his *Atlantic* review before the book was published.

⁶Mr. Carter to me, private letter.

⁷*The Atlantic Monthly*.

⁸T.L.S., May 31 and July 12, 1934.

man's representations are true or false, the very fact that he made them is strong indication of some kind of Forman collusion with Wise, and they deserve the most thorough investigation. It might seem too, that Maurice Forman's word as to the source of Wise's stock of the forgeries is worth as much as Gorfin's, upon which the Enquirers rely, for Gorfin, himself liable to indictment for fraudulent dealings, was in the very weak position of one who "turns King's evidence."

The most startling item in Mr. Carter's review of *Wise's Letters* is the date on which he first saw in Mr. Carl H. Pforzheimer's library a Forman-Wise interchange (note and reply on the same page) definitely connecting Forman with the forgeries. He says, "In March, 1935, I was invited to the library of Mr. Carl H. Pforzheimer, one of America's foremost book collectors, and offered the opportunity to inspect a document bearing on the origin of the forgeries, on condition that I should not publish it until its owner gave me permission." That date—March, 1935—brought me up with a start and sent me again to my files. I found the following paragraph from Mr. Carter, dated September 14, 1934, in answer to a question from me: "*Gosse, Forman, and Rossetti*. We have no reason to suppose any of these gentlemen were privy to the fraud. Gosse was clearly told the Reading *Sonnets* story by the forger or one of his accessories, in order that he might give it currency under his name with a view to substantiating the book. Forman cast aspersions on the story, although he accepts the Reading *Sonnets* and other forgeries as genuine; on what authority we do not know." This statement was written after Forman's son had published the two letters designed to confirm Wise's claim that he had the stock of forgeries he sold Gorfin from H. Buxton Forman, in which the younger Forman states definitely (1) that his father possessed a proof copy of *Sister Helen* given him by Watts-Dunton, and (2) that Wise's two copies of *Sonnets* came from his father. Either of these statements, unless disproved, was, according to the En-

quirers' arraignment of Wise, good "reason to suppose" Forman "was privy to the fraud." They certainly looked upon Wise's one-time possession of proof sheets of *The Runaway Slave* as a very serious matter, writing (p. 171), "The possession of proof sheets of a fraudulently printed book is a far more serious matter than a mere dozen or so copies of it, and Mr. Wise's position as the earliest discoverable handler of them [proof sheets of *The Runaway Slave*] will remain an embarrassing one until he chooses to provide further details about their previous history." Yet Mr. Carter, according to his answer to my questions, found nothing suspicious in Forman's possession of proof sheets of *Sister Helen*, another forgery.

Late in December, 1934, I read (had read for me) before the Modern Language Association a paper dealing with *The Runaway Slave*. After calling attention to a variant of the pamphlet which the Enquirers had not seen, this paper analyzed Forman's elaborate and pretentious essay sponsoring both *The Runaway Slave* and the spurious *Sonnets*, pointing out its double meanings and circumlocutions. The paper concludes:

If this is not the voice of the forger himself, it is that of his representative in an effort to give *The Runaway Slave* respectable standing in the bibliographical world by tying it up with *Two Poems*. Against the background of the Carter-Pollard disclosures he tells us more than he intended: that *Two Poems*, printed in 1854, was both the inspiration and model for the forgery of 1888 [*The Runaway Slave*]. If this speaker is not the actual forger, himself, it is plain that he is either the voice of the forger to establish the respectability of the pamphlet—and it must be remembered that he is in the same essay trying to establish the forged *Sonnets*—or he is himself completely taken in by the forger's rather thin story. . . . Add to this evidence the further fact that his name is closely connected with the entire story of the marketing of the forgeries . . . and one has heavy food for thought. The author of "Elizabeth Barrett Browning and Her Scarcer Books" was Harry Buxton Forman, seventeen years the senior of Mr. Wise.

A rather awkward paragraph it may be, but when condensed it says merely, that Forman in his essay sponsoring *The Run-away Slave* and *Sonnets* betrays himself as the forger, in collusion with the forger, or completely taken in by the forger. The last is improbable, for Forman was a much older and more experienced bookman than Wise. The statement is nothing more—was not intended for anything more—than my interpretation of Forman's passages, which I quoted, offered to the hearers for acceptance or rejection according as it seemed to them true or false.

Reports of my paper reached Mr. Carter, then in New York, who asked me for a copy, which I sent him. The exact date of its mailing does not appear in my records, but it was in his hands at the time (March 28) that he saw the Pforzheimer documents establishing conclusively Forman's participation in the fabrication of *The Last Tournament*, a forgery printed in the same type used for the Reading *Sonnets*. Yet with this inescapable evidence of Forman's guilt fresh in his knowledge, Mr. Carter not only failed to indicate to me that his conviction of Forman's innocence had undergone modification, but he "sternly" rebuked me on April 16 in a paragraph which, knowing as he did my ignorance of the Pforzheimer documents, was in effect a reiteration of his belief in Forman's innocence as expressed in his letter of the preceding September 14. "You accuse Buxton Forman without citing evidence," he wrote, "which seems to me more than unhelpful. If you can substantiate your charge against him, well and good. If you are not in a position to publish the substantiation, I venture to doubt the advisability of having published the charge."

Later *The Colophon*, planning to publish my paper, invited Mr. Carter to comment on it. His response was a masterpiece of double meaning which even Forman might have envied. Though written in full knowledge of Forman's guilt, like his letter of April 16, it conveys the impression that Mr. Carter believed my suspicions of Forman were wholly unjust;

and wickedly slanderous of an honored man of letters, though his every statement has a precautionary phrase or word against actual mendacity. He wrote:

Miss Ratchford's essay falls into two parts. The first, a discussion of the variant copies of *The Runaway Slave*: the second, a tolerably open statement of her opinion that the late Harry Buxton Forman, C.B., editor of Keats and Shelley and a scholar and collector of repute, was either the forger or in collusion with the forger. . . . Since Mr. Wise has now given Buxton Forman as the source from which he obtained them [his stock of the forgeries], we have naturally re-examined the published evidence afresh: but we are still waiting, along with Viscount Esher and other interested persons, for some substantiation from Mr. Wise himself of the grave charges implicit in his statement. . . . Aspersions of the kind made implicitly by Mr. Wise and explicitly by Miss Ratchford ought in common justice to be supported by some evidence a good deal stronger than bare general statements on his part, and the paper reprinted above on hers. This evidence presumably exists: let it be produced."

Interestingly enough, it was Mr. Carter himself, with his knowledge of the Pforzheimer document, even though he was not free to publish it, who had the key to abundant evidence of Forman's collusion with the forger. Again, as in case of the evidence against Wise referred to in the Page letter, why did he not produce it? Had he done so in either case the relationship between Wise and Forman—"so important, and, on the present evidence so nebulous"—would now be a matter of court records.

The most impassioned paragraphs in Mr. Carter's *Atlantic* review—the warmest I have seen from his pen, hotter even than his denunciations of Mr. Wise—are his stricture against Mr. Pforzheimer for delaying the publication of his documents. One of his milder paragraphs reads: "Mr. Pforzheimer, for reasons I have never understood persisted year after year in declining either to publish them [his Wise-Forman documents] or to allow anyone else to do so. . . . But if that

document had been published in Wise's lifetime, it might, conceivably, have extorted a full confession from him. And at least it must have elicited *some* statement, *some* addition, from the best possible authority, to the story of the most ingeniously conceived, the best executed, and the most successful fraud in the history of book collecting." Mr. Carter does not here or elsewhere give the full story of his connection with Mr. Pforzheimer's documents; and the omitted parts considerably alter the picture he paints. I myself first saw these documents in April, 1941, six years after Mr. Carter saw them. Though my introduction to *Wise's Letters* was already in draft, I made place for an additional section summarizing them. When the question of publication came up in the fall of 1943, Mr. Pforzheimer courteously and in utmost friendliness explained that since he had reached a decision to publish the documents, he felt bound by two considerations: (1) that Mr. Carter had the prior right to publication, and (2) that the documents, in fairness to both Wise and Forman, should be given to the public in their original form, entire in facsimile. Accordingly, early in 1944 Mr. Pforzheimer offered Mr. Carter the publication. He declined, pleading lack of time from war duties. Mr. Pforzheimer then transferred his offer to The University of Texas. After Texas had accepted, Mr. Carter reconsidered his refusal in peremptory terms conditioned on monetary payment to himself and profit to his firm. Mr. Pforzheimer explained that he was now obligated to us, but invited Mr. Carter to share in the work by contributing a postscript commenting on my introduction, the documents, and any other feature he pleased. Mr. Carter wrote a postscript, a very peculiar postscript, calculated, it might seem from its censure of Mr. Pforzheimer, to halt rather than hasten the publication he professed to desire. Its spirit and intent is reflected in his letter to me of November, 1944: "I think he [Mr. Pforzheimer] may decide not to use it [the postscript], but I don't know just how sensitive he is to irony."

In this postscript, as in the above paragraph from *The Atlantic*, Mr. Carter suggested that Mr. Pforzheimer in withholding the documents from publication, "denied to innocent purchasers of the forgeries the grounds for legal action against their perpetrator, who lived for more than two years after his discovery of this decisive evidence." He ventured also the possibility "that publication of these papers during Wise's lifetime must have elicited from him, if not a full confession, at least some statement which would have thrown a more sustained light (now lost forever) on the forgeries affair in general and particularly on the relationship between Wise and Forman—so important and, on the present evidence, so nebulous." Thus Mr. Carter turns to Mr. Pforzheimer's account the charge of suppressing evidence and obstructing justice which might more justly be urged against him, for according to their message to Wise through Mr. Page, Messrs. Carter and Pollard, when they published *An Enquiry*, had in their possession proof of Wise's guilt as forger. They charged Mr. Page, it may be remembered, to tell Wise, "very weightily charged [him] indeed," that if Wise, Page, or Maurice Buxton Forman once again brought forward any suggestion of Harry Buxton Forman's complicity in the forgeries, the Enquirers would produce their proofs of Wise's guilt. They stated that though Clay's had indeed destroyed their ledgers before 1911, they (the Enquirers) could still produce a record of Wise's account with them, and they were fully persuaded that they could prove a charge of fraud and forgery against Wise, but would abstain from doing so unless he forced them.

Why, then, should Mr. Carter condemn Mr. Pforzheimer for failing to assume the responsibility he and Mr. Pollard passed by?

Again, Maurice Forman in his two letters to the *Times Literary Supplement* shed a veritable floodlight of illumination into "the forgery affair in general and particularly . . . the relationship between Wise and Forman," which, unfortunately,

was too quickly cut off by the Enquirers' warning conveyed through Page. They justify their action on the ground of fairness to a dead man, but why do they not credit Mr. Pforzheimer with the same scruples? If it was unjust for Forman's son to recount his father's activities, why should Mr. Pforzheimer be pressed to bring forth his documents condemning him?

Mr. Carter in his pronouncement of utter finality, "now lost forever," forgets that there is one man still living who in all probability knows the story of the forgeries in its entirety, who is almost as nearly concerned as was Wise. Perhaps Maurice Buxton Forman confronted with the Pforzheimer documents will illuminate the obscurity which Mr. Carter laments as final.

Mr. Carter's condemnation of Mr. Pforzheimer seems to imply that the documents in question are the only real evidence against Forman, that the evidence which I submit was more or less trumped up out of my knowledge of these documents. He writes: "Miss Ratchford builds up her case against Forman with vigor. She cannot play the ace because Mr. Pforzheimer has it . . . but she knows it is there . . . that knowledge enables her to ruff and finesse elsewhere with a freedom which she may be thought to have exercised rather too enthusiastically." The fact is quite the contrary. My conviction of Forman's complicity was definite and full formed before I heard even a rumor of the existence of the Pforzheimer documents; it was expressed in tentative form to Mr. Carter in August, 1934. Most of the evidence I cite is drawn from the same sources the Enquirers used, and much of it was suggested by *An Enquiry* itself. While I was and am grateful to Mr. Pforzheimer for a sight of his papers which gave me confidence in my reading of the evidence, the introduction to *Wise's Letters* owes nothing to those papers. It went to press just as it would have gone had I never seen the Pforzheimer documents.

Mr. Carter thinks, too, that I indulge in special pleading in my case against Forman, "particularly in respect to the sensibility to . . . commonplace contemporary type designs which can legitimately be postulated. . . ." Forman in 1888, by his own statement, knew as a forgery the spurious *Siena*, printed in "the forger's favorite type," already familiar to him as belonging to Clay and Sons through the Shelley Society's facsimile reprints of *Alastor*, 1887, and notes to *Hellas*, 1886. He probably saw in that year (1888) *Brother and Sister*, printed in the same type. He certainly knew, in 1893, Wise's facsimile reprint of *Alaric at Rome*, in the same type, bearing Clay's imprint. In 1896, he analyzed the typography of *Sonnets*, also in "the forger's favorite type," commenting on its unlikeness to the work of Bradbury and Evans, "who printed the poetess's work" for both Moxon and Chapman and Hall. In the same year he commented critically on *Morte D'Arthur*, *Lucretius*, and *The Last Tournament*, other forgeries in the same peculiar hybrid font. His library as sold in 1920 contained eight more forgeries in this type. In 1897 he commented authoritatively on the typography of *Sir Galahad* as unlike that of the Chiswick Press which printed Morris's other books of the period. On what basis does Mr. Carter call the citing of such a train of evidence special pleading? It is similar to—in several points identical with—that by which he and Mr. Pollard established Wise's connection with the Clay-printed forgeries. There is ample clear evidence that Forman knew much more of typography than did Wise, and was a keen observer.

An important additional bit of evidence definitely connecting Forman with Wise in the fabrication of *The Last Tournament* has come to my attention since the publication of *Wise's Letters*. Mr. Arthur Pforzheimer, a book dealer of New York City, has kindly sent me a copy of a letter that passed through his hands. To get its full revelations one must remember that the forged "trial edition" of *The Last Tournament*, 1871, bears the imprint, "Strahan & Co." The note, though dated January

30, 1904, more than seven years after the fabrication of the pamphlet, is fraught with warning of trouble:

My dear Forman,

Re "Building of the Idylls," last few pages. "Enid" was 'undone' in the edition of 1886. "Building of the Idylls" says 1888. Some years ago I was positively assured that Strahan was dead. I find that he is still very much alive, 74 years of age, & quite lively. He is coming to spend an evening & talk Tennyson in a few days.

How are *you*?

Yours alys
Tom Wise

It is to be hoped that Wise reported the meeting with Strahan to Forman in writing, and that his letter may come to light to complete the farce the two men were playing. Its high points may be deduced, however, from the fact that Strahan on that visit or later, inscribed for Mr. Wise three copies of *The Last Tournament*, together with *Ode for the Opening of the International Exhibition* and *A Welcome to Alexandrovna*, all forgeries.

By the time *Wise's Letters* was off press, knowledge of the Pforzheimer documents was general throughout book circles; only the most poorly informed reviewers attempted any defense of Forman. Mr. Carter and those who follow his line of thought have concerned themselves chiefly with explanations of how the Enquirers missed Forman's hand in the great fraud. Their full enthusiasm and energy, however, is directed against my fifth and last "accusation," that Sir Edmund Gosse (1) in publishing originally the story of the false Reading *Sonnets*, repeating and defending it for thirty-three years in face of evidence he was under moral obligation to heed, shared with Wise the responsibility of this, the most sensational and reprehensible of the forgeries, in fifty-fifty proportions, and (2) he had a hand in fabricating *The Runaway Slave*.

Their defense on the first point is that Gosse was completely taken in by the forger, but Gosse by all circumstantial logic should have been the hardest man of all the surviving Browning circle to deceive in such a matter. He had been intimately associated with Browning for many years, receiving his confidences as fully, perhaps, as anyone then living other than young Robert Browning. Twelve years before he first told the story in print he had taken notes from Browning himself for the best biography of the poet published in his lifetime. It is probable almost to the point of certainty that Browning at sometime told him of his discovery of "Sonnets" in manuscript and their publication, just as he wrote it to at least three persons.⁹ Gosse's "well known vanity and egotism," it seems, would have combined with his experience and memory to question the new and startling story of the Reading *Sonnets*, had it come from such a literary upstart as Wise at that time must have appeared to him.¹⁰ To test such doubts as he had, or should have had, it was but necessary to refer to others of Browning's intimates. For absolute certainty he had access to Browning's son. It seems to me wholly improbable that Wise or anyone else could have offered any evidence in favor of the pamphlet that Gosse's own experience would not have denied.

⁹Several persons have called my attention to an even fuller account by Elizabeth herself which I had seen but neglected to use, found among the papers of her nephew, Lieutenant-Colonel Harry Peyton Moulton-Barrett, which were sold at Sotheby's on June 7, 1937. In a letter to her sister Arabel, dated January 12, 1851, she speaks at length of the sonnets, saying, among other things, "The truth is that they (i.e., the sonnets) were written several years ago. I never showed them to Robert till last Spring. . . . I felt shy about them altogether . . . even to him. I had heard him express himself strongly against 'personal' poetry, and I shrank back. As to publishing them, it did not enter my head. But when Robert saw them he was much touched and pleased—and thinking highly of the poetry, he did not like . . . could not consent, he said, that they should be lost to my volume [*Poems*, 1850] and so after much consideration chose the 'Portuguese.'"

¹⁰See Wilfred Partington's *Forging Ahead*, pp. 48 and 165.

So much for circumstantial evidence and inference. Hardly was *An Enquiry* off press before a letter from Gosse came to light which, it seems to me, condemns Gosse as partner in perpetrating the "Reading" *Sonnets* as definitely as the Pforzheimer documents condemn Forman as partner in fabricating *The Last Tournament*. Mr. Carter's ingenious interpretation of this letter has at present no more than his supposition to back it. Even he admits that the letter is a "brush-off" made up of half-truths and indicates that Gosse was accessory after the fact. It is addressed to J. R. Burton¹¹ in reply to his inquiry concerning discrepancies between Gosse's story of the "Reading" *Sonnets* and Browning's own account of his discovery of the manuscript and its publication in *Poems*, 1850, as told in a letter to Dr. Peter Bayne, a copy of which was transmitted to Miss Lilian Whiting by Browning's son, and published by her in *The Brownings: Their Life and Their Art*, 1911.

¹¹Text of the Burton letter:

17, Hanover Terrace
Regent's Park, N.W. 1
London,
April 12, '27

Dear Sir:

In reply to your letter about the Portuguese Sonnets:—

Mr. Robert Browning told me (I think in the year 1887) the story regarding the authorship of those poems which I have told in my "Critical Kit-Kats" and elsewhere.

I do not know who "Lilian Whiting" may be, but of the version said to be given by Robert B. Browning, the poet's son, I have only this to remark,—that young Browning was not born when his Mother gave the packet of sonnets to his Father, and that his statement, if he made it, cannot have the same authority as that seriously and explicitly made to me by Mr. Browning himself, when he was saying [*sic*] when he knew I was taking notes of his speech.

The only correction of my account which I can make is that perhaps the conversation was later than "eight years before" Mr. Browning's death, because I was in close relation with him from 1876 until 1889, and I cannot fix the date of these particular statements.

Believe me to be, Dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
Edmund Gosse

Mr. J. R. Burton

Though Gosse's reply is vague, and as Mr. Carter concedes, evasive and made up of half-truths, it seems to say—taken as a whole—that Gosse had the story he told of Reading *Sonnets* directly from Browning. If this be true, since the story is false, he could not have had it from Browning, and it follows that Gosse knew it was false when he wrote it. Mr. Carter's defensive analysis and my reasons for differing with him have been given in Part I of this review of reviews.

Dr. W. O. Raymond¹² calls attention to two items of information having a bearing on the discussion which, he thinks, accounts for the betraying date "1847" on the titlepage of forged *Sonnets* and the erroneous use of Pisa as the place of Browning's discovery of the manuscript. Miss Barrett, shortly before the elopement, wrote Robert Browning, presumably in reference to her sonnets, which she had not yet found courage to show him, "You will see some day at Pisa what I will not show you now. Does not Solomon say that there is a time to read what is written. If he doesn't he *ought*." This passage, Dr. Raymond thinks, misled the forger or forgers into the blunder of dating the "Reading" *Sonnets* 1847 instead of 1849, and Gosse into fixing Pisa as the place of discovery. Dr. Raymond shows further that the place error of Pisa for Bagni di Lucca was in circulation as early as 1890, four years before Gosse's disastrous essay, for William Sharp in his life of Browning, published in that year says, "It was here in Pisa, as I have been told on indubitable authority, that Browning first saw in manuscript those *Sonnets from the Portuguese*. . . ." These data, while interesting and important in completing the picture, do not, so far as I see, materially improve Gosse's position. The facts remain that the "Reading" story whenever and by whom it was told him, cuts squarely against Gosse's experience as the intimate confidant of Browning, and was contrary to definitive evidence within his reach. Their exact

¹²*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, July, 1945.

place in the story depends upon the fabrication date of the forgery, as yet unknown.

It is unfortunate, perhaps, that my identification of "mangoes" in the margin of the Wrenn proof of *The Runaway Slave* as Gosse's writing (*Wise's Letters*, pp. 92-93) was not offered in a footnote rather than in the text; for in all reviews I have seen, it has been treated in such a way as to overshadow incontestable evidence. Though I am myself as sure of its correctness as I can be of any fact that rests on recognition, I have not been able to get the opinion of a court expert. All give the same reply—the standard ("mangoes") is too scant for definitive analysis. By the same token those I have appealed to decline to give an opinion on the meticulously written corrections of the proof of *Bullen's Letters* which I know to be Gosse's. Though a majority of reviewers dismiss the evidence of "mangoes" as unwarranted "suspicion" on my part, not a single one, it appears, has actually looked at the facsimile I offer, for none has noticed its most significant feature, the italicized *e*. Mr. Carter in failing to notice it, either in the photostat copy I sent him in 1934, the facsimile I published, or my repeated writing of the word, suggests that it is Wise's hand. Aside from recognition—perhaps I should say negative recognition—I had two conclusive points against the natural guess that "mangoes" was written by Wise: (1) The word occurs in the margin of page 22, following instructions to the printer ("alter indentations" and "pull out") on pages 10 and 18, unmistakably in Wise's hand though written with a finer pen than his later writing with which I am familiar to the saturation point. Why, after writing these two instructions in his natural hand, should Wise have taken so much care to disguise his hand in "mangoes"? (2) The italicized *e* in "mangoes" indicates that it was not inserted for the printer's attention, which would be Wise's only apparent reason for writing it, and the correction in spelling does not appear in the finished pamphlet. The italicized *e* indicates a jibe at Wise's

spelling, which suggests Forman, but by no stretch of imagination can the writing be ascribed to him. It also savors very strongly of Gosse's scathing satire of Wise's spelling quoted by Wilfred Partington in *Forging Ahead*, pp. 165-6. Whoever wrote the word, it was not, I am convinced, either Wise or Forman. Who, then, was the third forger?

Mr. David Randall excited me by his statement, "It is well known that he [Gosse] bought some of them [the forgeries] for his own collection." This, if true, would be an important bit of evidence indeed. I wrote Mr. Randall immediately, asking for details of the purchase or purchases. He replied, "You will find that documented in Carter's forthcoming article in *The Atlantic Monthly*." When Mr. Carter's article came, I eagerly picked out from its pages the sentence, "I propose, therefore, to put in evidence two letters: one from Wise to Gosse about selling him some forgeries; the other from Gosse to Wise acknowledging the gift of another forgery." To my utter disappointment, the first letter¹³ contains neither word

¹³Text:

Mon. 19th 1896.

My Dear Gosse,

Thanks for yours. I am so glad the little books please you. You shall most certainly have the "Agatha" [by George Eliot—a forgery] as soon as I can find it. It is generally understood and I think rightly, that 25 copies of "Brother and Sister" [another forgery] were printed—as there were of "Agatha"—but I have no absolutely certain and unquestionable evidence to go on as I have in the case of "Agatha."

It may interest you to know that the copy of "Leoni" [by Ruskin—a forgery] I sent you was formerly the property of Fredk. Crawley, Mr. Ruskin's old factotum, now living at Oxford upon a pension of £100 a year allowed him from Brantwood. I looked him up in 1889 when I was hunting all around for material for my Ruskin Bibliography. I bought from him all the relics he had—books, letters, sketches, among other things this tract.

Forgive this haste.

Yours,

T. J. Wise

Crawley served Wise well as a provenance for the forgeries. See *Wise's Letters*, pp. 176 and 179.

nor implication to justify or even suggest Mr. Carter's characterization, "about selling him some of the forgeries." It shows merely that Wise had sent Gosse some "little books" and promises him a copy of *Agatha*, "as soon as I can find it." There is no evidence whatsoever that Wise was selling Gosse the "little books" and *Agatha*, nor even any proof that the "little books" were forgeries, though one infers that they were. The implication of this letter when read with the second¹⁴ Mr. Carter submits and several others of its kind I have seen, is, rather, that Mr. Wise is giving Gosse the books or making one of their habitual exchanges.¹⁵

The second letter, Gosse to Wise, thanking him for a copy of *Dolores*, Mr. Carter thinks establishes Gosse's ignorance of the fraudulent nature of this pamphlet. But this is not necessarily so, for such notes as these two were one of Wise's

¹⁴Text:

17 Hanover Terrace
London, 27/10/09

How generous and how kind of you, my dear Wise, to give me this beautiful copy of the 1867 "*Dolores*" [by Swinburne—a forgery]. I am very grateful to you.

Have you ever solved the mystery of its production? I have very minutely collated it with the text of 1866, and there are three extremely trifling variations. All three are errors in 1867 where 1866 was correct. I wonder whether Hotten [the publisher of *Poems and Ballads* (1866), whose imprint was quite plausibly used on the titlepage of the forgery (1867)] had any secret object in this production? Why he did it, in fact? It would be interesting to try and work out the causes of the reprint, which I suppose, from its present rarity, was very limited. . . .

Yours sincerely,
Edmund Gosse

¹⁵Wise's reference to *Brother and Sister*—presumably one of the "little books" he sent Gosse—recalls a note by Professor Chauncey B. Tinker, in *The Saturday Review of Literature* for August 11, 1934. "Some ten years ago," he writes, "the present writer and a friend, also interested in book-collecting, became suspicious of the pamphlet issue of George Eliot's '*Brother and Sister*,' 'For private circulation only,' 1869. A prominent firm of booksellers in London who had sold the book were asked to authenticate it. They replied that our queries had been submitted to Mr. (afterwards Sir) Edmund Gosse, who belittled our suspicions and defended the authenticity of the pamphlet, but desired the booksellers to make nothing of his connection with the incident."

favorite and very successful methods of "planting" the forgeries, whether with Gosse's connivance may be a question in some minds. Corresponding closely to certain cryptograms between Wise and Forman, they suggest to the "suspiciously minded" that the two men were thus putting on record bibliographical details of the forgeries as agreed on between them. Laid in copies of the "dainty little rarities" in Gosse's and Wise's libraries or in the sales room, such notes could easily be manipulated to meet many a collector's eye. More than that, I have in hand several notes from Gosse so similar to the second one Mr. Carter prints that I might as well offer them in evidence that he had no part in pamphlets for which he actually wrote the introduction and corrected proof, such for instance as the following:

17, Hanover Terrace
Regent's Park, N.W.
5. 12. 10.

My dear Wise

I delay in thanking you for the kind gift of 2 copies of the latest Swinburne pamphlet. It looks very nice, I think; and the letters are more personal than others which you have printed. I think they present him in a very amiable light.

How are you? Very well, I hope, and still enjoying the new house?

Yours ever
Edmund Gosse

As a matter of obvious fact the two letters which Mr. Carter submits add nothing to my statement (*Wise's Letters*, p. 87) in reference to the forgeries in Gosse's library, "It is certain, so far as Wise's letters can be trusted, that several were gifts from him."

More interesting even than the reviewers' comments in condemnation or defense of Gosse are those I have received in personal letters. An English correspondent who knew Wise's "roguery" at first hand, an intimate friend of the second Mrs. Thomas Hardy, observed in a recent letter to me, "What a

rogue he [Wise] was and Mrs. T[homas] H[ardy] made me infer that Sir Edmund Gosse was in on it [the forgeries] with him." This sentence reminded me of a forgotten earlier report of Mrs. Hardy's remark. In a letter dated January 2, 1942, I found the statement: "Mrs. Hardy told me *Gosse* was his [Wise's] partner in this crime [the forgeries]." Inquiry revealed the time and occasion of the telling: "Mrs. Thomas Hardy and I discussed Carter and Pollard's book. She showed me [Maurice] Buxton Forman's (most feeble) denial of T. J. Wise's guilt, & then we talked of Sir Edmund Gosse. . . . It was when C. & P.'s book first came out—I forget, but you will know."

Of those who have spoken for Gosse, in print or in personal letters and conversations, it is surprising that none have done so on positive grounds; all base their defense on his "well known" inaccuracy, carelessness of facts, vanity, egotism, love of applause, and general irresponsible muddleheadedness—a characterization incomprehensible to me, for after all Gosse not only lived out his seventy-nine years as a responsible person, but he enjoyed the greatest prestige as critic of any Englishman of his day. He held the responsible post of Librarian of the House of Lords, and was knighted in recognition of his eminence in literature.

The voluminous strange defense offered in his behalf is summed up and climaxed in an anonymous article entitled "More Light on the Wise Forgeries" in *Times Literary Supplement* for April 28, 1945: "That the literary methods of Edmund Gosse were unconscionably slap-dash is well-known. The vanity of Gosse, his irresponsibility, his passion to hear himself applauded and, worst of all, his complete lack of serious principle regarding life or letters are faults admitted by his best friends." If this devastating arraignment represents the judgment of Gosse's friends, why should anyone think it worthwhile to defend him against any indictment? Even forgery might be expected as a mere by-product of "complete lack of

serious principle regarding life. . . ." Nothing so condemning has been said of Wise himself, with all his many sins pretty well catalogued. Poor Gosse! Be he innocent or guilty of my "accusations," his "friends," it seems to me, have damned him. One can hardly believe that he altogether deserves their devastating defense.

Mr. Carter attacks my phrase (*Wise's Letters*, p. 77), "Wise-Forman-Gosse workshop," which has not, as he implies, the remotest connection with any of the forgeries. In fact it precedes any indication of Gosse's and Forman's complicity in the fraud. It occurs in my discussion of Mr. Wise's "lot purchases" for Mr. Wrenn: "Where, then—if Wise's accounts are rejected—did the hundreds of volumes included in the lots sold to Wrenn come from? . . . It is a safe guess that many of the volumes included in the numerous lots sold Wrenn were made up in the Wise-Forman-Gosse workshop, but again one wonders why Wise should have been so secretive, for such making-up is an accepted practice in the book world." "Wise-Forman-Gosse workshop" as I use it has no reference to the forgeries and no derogatory implication whatsoever, and my use of it is fully justified by the acknowledged habit of the three men to exchange leaves needed to perfect imperfect books.

Several reviewers have misread passages of my Introduction to *Wise's Letters*. Mr. Randall writes:¹⁶ "She [Miss Ratch-

¹⁶Mr. Randall makes two other corrections which are somewhat misleading: "Miss Ratchford is careless in bibliographical matters. For example she illustrates in facsimile a letter of Sir Edmund Gosse, yet in transcribing it, on page 86, omits four words." These four words were omitted, not carelessly, but advisedly: they are repetitions, cancellations in effect. Since the document was reproduced in facsimile, to include the repeated phrase followed by the conventional *sic* seemed confusing rather than helpful.

"She [Miss Ratchford] also states that Wise gave Beverley Chew a copy of the Ashley Catalogue 'on Japanese vellum paper,' yet Wise in a letter of Dec. 26, 1909, explicitly states that it was a copy on handmade paper." Both statements might well be true, for Japanese vellum is handmade paper. As a matter of fact, the text of the catalogue in question is printed on

ford] states boldly that the terminal *s* (in the proof correction 'mangoes') 'is Gosse's most characteristic letter.' But in her own facsimiles of Gosse's handwriting this distinctive *s* is used initially not terminally." My statement, read with attention to quotation marks and following clause, says that the "terminal *s*" [quoted from Mr. Wise] of "mangoes" is Gosse's most characteristic letter, not that it is his characteristic *terminal s*. Its position in the word—initial, middle or terminal—was so far from my mind that, merely by chance, no facsimile of its terminal use was presented. The omission is here corrected in a facsimile page of Gosse's writing showing several instances of that peculiar letter used terminally.

Mr. George Goodspeed in *The Atlantic Monthly* for March, 1945, says,¹⁷ "One aspect of the Wise-Wrenn letters . . . suggests an important possibility which Miss Ratchford appears to have overlooked (or ignored). . . . It seems more than probable that each transaction [with Wrenn] . . . carried a concealed profit for Wise, the purveyor." Most certainly it did, so obviously so that to mention or point it out seemed unnecessary. That Wise made sizable profit is inherent in the facts that (1) over and over he sold Mr. Wrenn, under false pretense, books that he himself had gathered together; (2) that such alleged purchases contained in many cases copies of forgeries which accounted for a large proportion of the inclusive sum paid; and (3) often to the inclusive price was added an imaginary agent's commission. The point to my em-

Whatman's handmade paper; the illustrations, making up about one-third of both volumes, are on Japanese vellum.

¹⁷Mr. Goodspeed makes also this helpful suggestion: "On page 460 [*Wise's Letters*] appears the following sentence: 'I think we shall see the year out with a 6 percent rate. . . .' May it, perhaps, not refer to the current rate of interest in banking circles?" This seems correct. R. G. Hawtrey's *A Century of Bank Rates*, Appendix I, p. 294 records the bank rate for October 19, 1906 and 126/7 weeks thereafter as 6%. Mr. Hobson of Sotheby's offers the same suggestion, writing: "The English Bank Rate . . . was raised to the very high figure of 6% on October 19, 1906. . . . I have not troubled to look up when it was changed."

17. Hanover Terrace
Regents Park, N.W.

15. 3. 902

My dear Wise

I am very grateful
to you for your generous gift
of the "Duke's Mistress". It will
make a capital copy in the
hands of Riviere. Years have
passed since I added to my
collection of Shirley. The only
ones I do not possess are
"The Wadding" 1629, "Love's Cruelty"
1640, and "Cupid and Death" 1658.
There are not at all likely
ever to come in my way.

Your Catalogue will

phasis on the fact that Mr. Wrenn paid no recognizable commission is that Mr. Wise thus built up in Wrenn's mind a sense of obligation to him for his friendly services.

Dr. Robert Metcalf Smith writes:¹⁸ "The reader is left wondering by what sort of logic Miss Ratchford contends that when Wise was exposed and a public explanation awaited: 'a straightforward answer could have saved his reputation.' " *Contend* is too strong a word; *suggest* better measures my meaning, and my logic is clear enough when the sentence is read with its obvious implication: "A straightforward answer [could he have made it] would have saved his reputation."

Similarly Mr. Carl J. Weber writes:¹⁹ "Miss Ratchford remarks (p. 73): 'Could the assigned pedigree of a single forgery be verified, the balance of judgment must turn in Wise's favor.' If he could be proved to have told the truth just once, we would forget the forty-nine lies?" This reading is not justified by either the wording itself or the context of the passage. Up to this point there was no proof for or against Wise's statements of provenance of the "lot purchases" containing forgeries which he made for Wrenn. If a single one could be proven true, the probability of the truth of others would be established and the balance of judgment would tip in his favor; if false, the scales would go against him. It so happened that Wise's own words prove that he lied in the Hake instance; therefore, we doubt him in all others.

Mr. Donald G. Wing makes several errors which are insignificant as coming from a reviewer, but which would denote inexcusable ignorance and carelessness had I made them. He writes:²⁰ "The Wise who emerges . . . is the man with whom Mr. and Mrs. Wrenn spend delightful vacations on the continent. . . ." Mrs. Wrenn is not mentioned in connec-

¹⁸*The Publisher's Weekly*, December 23, 1944.

¹⁹"Letters of Thomas J. Wise to John Henry Wrenn," in *Modern Language Notes*, May, 1945.

²⁰"A Bookman's Letters," in *The Yale Review*, Summer, 1945.

tion with the Wrenn-Wise vacations, or, indeed, in the entire book. She died in the spring of 1902, before Mr. Wrenn's intimacy with the Wises began. On page 12 I specifically name Harold and Ethel Wrenn as members of Mr. Wrenn's family with him on one or more of his excursions with the Wises.

Mr. Wing thinks that "Wise is most amusing when he condemns such American collectors as . . . Paul Lemperley, and A. J. Morgan. . . ." Wise, so far as I remember, does not mention Mr. Lemperley in his letters to Wrenn, and, according to the present evidence, "A. J. Morgan" is a mythical personage of Mr. Wise's own creation to build up the price of the forgeries in Mr. Wrenn's mind. It is J. Pierpont Morgan for whom Wise has unloving words as a speculator in rare books. Mr. Wing regrets that my "consuming suspicion was not directed at a few more titles instead of a number of men no longer able to defend themselves." I did give considerable attention to suspicious titles. That I added but one to the known list is not so much a criticism of my work as it is a tribute to Messrs. Carter and Pollard's thoroughness, supplemented by Mr. Roland Baughman's discoveries. In summary he thinks that "Buxton Forman and Sir Edmund Gosse are condemned on what has generally seemed slight evidence," while all reviews I have seen—that by Dr. Carl J. Weber in *Modern Language Notes* excepted—admit the case against Forman is pretty well proved. The opinion concerning Gosse is divided, but even Mr. John Carter in *The Atlantic Monthly* for February, 1945, now admits that he was accessory after the fact. The private letters I have received, representing a cross section of the book world—bibliographers, booksellers, collectors, and scholars—indicate that Forman is universally considered guilty of collusion with Wise. Those who defend Gosse as the dupe of Wise base their defense on qualities of character which, after all, add nothing to the public's belief in his integrity.

ADDENDA

From readers of *Letters of Thomas J. Wise to John Henry Wrenn* come the following additional bits of information:

MR. L. W. MARTIN of Dunton's Inc. informs me that the English publishers of Miss Lilian Whiting's *The Brownings* (*Wise's Letters*, p. 85n) were Hodder and Stoughton. A note of inquiry addressed to that firm brought the reply, "Sales of Miss Whiting's *The Brownings* in this country were 362 copies." A second edition was brought out in 1919.

MR. CHARLES F. HEARTMAN comments regarding A. J. Bowden (*Wise's Letters*, pp. 45-46): "It grieves me to see that his [Wise's] remark *re* A. J. Bowden did get into the book without a contradictory footnote. I knew Bowden well. At one time he was a partner of Geo. D. Smith; he was a keen bookman, a bibliographer, and a great book-lover. He became associated with the Richmond Literature Company, and at the death of Richmond wound up that concern. He was a bitter enemy of fakers and forgers, who dreaded him." See also *George D. Smith* by Charles F. Heartman, 1945.

MR. CHRISTIAN GERHARDT, too, spoke in high terms of Bowden as a bookman of knowledge and integrity. He described him as "short and red headed," a race track gambler and hard drinker. Before coming to America he was associated with Henry Sothern in London. Mr. Gerhardt remarked also that Wise's strictures (*Wise's Letters*, p. 263) on the sale catalogue of the library of Thomas Jefferson McKee were unfair. It was this catalogue, he said, the work of Mr. John P. Anderson, that established the compiler's reputation as a bibliographer and prepared the way for the opening of the Anderson Galleries. He added that Mr. George M. Williamson was not a book speculator, as Wise charges (*Wise's Letters*, pp. 329-330), but a real collector.

MR. SIMON NOWELL-SMITH of Oxford, England, answers my question (*Wise's Letters*, p. 88), "Had Gosse reprinted his catalogue . . .?" by calling my attention to a volume I had not before seen, "*The Library of Sir Edmund Gosse*, compiled by E. H. M. Cox, with an Introductory Essay by Mr. Gosse," 1924. Though Gosse's Introductory Essay has been considerably revised since 1893, the paragraph relating to his modern books is reprinted almost verbatim. The text of the volume lists 15 of the forgeries, none of which were present in the 1893 catalogue. The volume is "Inscribed with Admiration and Respect to Thomas J. Wise."

DR. NEWMAN I. WHITE, commenting on the statement (*Wise's Letters*, p. 55) that visitors to Mr. Wise, after the exposé, usually saw him in the presence of Maurice Buxton Forman, makes this statement: "I had perhaps a dozen interviews with Mr. Wise in the spring of 1936, and I suppose that Mr. Forman was present at not more than half of them. He explained to me himself (for whatever you may think it worth) that he always spent Saturday afternoon with Mr. Wise, because at the time his own father died Mr. Wise had begun spending much of his afternoon time with Mrs. Forman. It is true that when he was present Mr. Forman seemed pretty well aware of the conversation, but he did not impress me as really standing guard on him. My colleague, Dr. Paul Franklin Baum, had one or two interviews with Mr. Wise immediately after the Carter-Pollard exposure and has never seen Mr. Forman." Dr. White continues, "I was much impressed by your evidence that Mr. Forman was poking secret fun at his collaborators in forgery. Mr. Carter took no notice of this, nor did you pursue it far enough to satisfy my curiosity. I could not doubt from your evidence that Mr. Forman *was* doing just that. But, does not the fact raise a really crucial question about the whole case? *Why* did he do it? Evidently he did and so the reason why—if we could find it—ought to be a leading clue to the story behind these forgeries. As yet no

one has set forth a really convincing motive. This circumstance ought to fit in with the motive. The only hypothetical explanation I can suggest is that the forgery may have started as a hoax and that these taunting references may have been written deliberately (1) as a kind of game within a game (2) as the necessary proof to adduce later when the hoax was to be self-exposed. Why was it not revealed later, then? Because it became too profitable? Because the other hoaxers died and Wise thought he could 'get away with it'? Because it succeeded so disastrously that they decided a self-exposure would not be accepted? This point puzzles me a great deal and I do wish you would give it some more study if you write further on the question."

All these suggestive questions proposed by Dr. White I have turned over in my mind many times, both before and since I had his letter, without finding an answer that fits all the evidence. From the beginning I have felt that Gosse was drawn into the scheme through *The Runaway Slave* and *Sonnets* as an ill-natured practical joke on American collectors, whom he deeply resented as "the plague of the earth." I find no conclusive evidence that he was directly concerned in others, though, it seems to me, he must have known their nature and consented, to the extent at least that he did nothing to discredit them. The hypothetical picture of Wise and Gosse or Wise, Gosse, and Forman "framing up" on American collectors, who were "ruining" the London rare book market, is to me more realistic and truer to the evidence than Mr. Carter's graphic presentation of Gosse as imposed upon by a copy of the Reading *Sonnets* shown him by Wise, who could not have given him a satisfactory account of its origin, i.e., one that Gosse could not easily have checked. If Gosse was as vain of his association with Browning and as stubborn in his opinions as his defenders represent him, he would not readily have yielded to Wise's claims of superior knowledge, even when backed up by a pamphlet which Browning in all

their long and confidential friendship had never mentioned to him.

MR. GEOFFREY D. HOBSON of Sotheby and Company sends the following notes: "(p. 39) There is an additional reason which I think nobody has ever mentioned, for knowing the Reading *Sonnets* to be a forgery. Had it been genuine there must have been a copy among the Browning books. I fetched these from Italy in 1912 and I well remember my disappointment at not finding a copy of the Reading *Sonnets* in the tin box which contained all the most precious Browning books and MSS. It is quite inconceivable that, if the book were genuine, Browning should not have had a copy from his wife, as he kept everything connected with her, including every tiny scrap of paper, however insignificant. (p. 512, note 12) The uncut, unopened copy of the Posthumous Fragments of Margaret Nicholson was in the Burdett Coutts sale here, in a very large accumulation of old music which was Lot 337 in the sale of May 15/17th, 1922. The sale came to us through the late Sir Hercules Read of the British Museum. We selected the books we wanted and left the rest to be sold at the house. The music was not selected but was put into our sale at the last moment because Sir Hercules said it had been overlooked at the house and could not go in the house sale so we put it in to do him a favour as he was a very good friend. He assured us that the music had been gone through by one of his colleagues at the British Museum and that there was nothing of value in it. It would, in any case, have been impossible for us to go through such a large stack of valueless material on the off-chance of finding something of value in it. It was bought by a bookseller. I give you this information as I am probably the only person who knows the exact story of this very curious episode."

Mr. Hobson makes the point, apropos of my remark regarding Mr. Tom Hodge (*Wise Letters*, p. 17), that Mr. Hodge was "never a dealer at all; the profession of auctioneer and

dealer are quite distinct." And Mr. G. S. DES GRAZ of the same firm repeats the distinction: "May I venture to suggest that our predecessor, Mr. Tom Hodge, should not be described in the Index as a 'bookseller. . . .' Tom Hodge was an auctioneer of books and other kinds of property, and we should not like it to be thought that he also acted as a dealer—the combination of the two activities being regarded here as highly unethical."

MR. EARL E. FISK has written me two letters "chock-full" of interesting and pertinent suggestions. He calls attention to a volume offered for sale by James F. Drake in 1932 (Cat. 233, Item 127), *Parables and Tales*, bearing the inscription "A. E. & F. Hake from their father—the Author." "It could be," he comments, "that A. E. Hake, the son of Dr. Hake, was the 'Arthur Hake' mentioned by Mr. Wise." This is very likely. I spent a good many hours in the New York Public Library seeking—without success—the names of Dr. Hake's sons. Even though there may have been—probably was—a real "Arthur Hake," and Wise may have bought books from him, he did not buy from him the books sold to Mr. Wrenn as the Hake Collection. (See *Wise's Letters*, Index.)

Mr. Fisk calls attention also to Wise's description in his Tennyson Bibliography of *The Sailor Boy* (a forgery) which mentions an unidentified Coventry Patmore item: "The Victoria press was not altogether a charity, although the whole of the pieces—in prose and verse—contained in the pages of *The Victoria Regia* were contributed gratuitously by their several authors. As a mark of grateful courtesy Miss Faithful reprinted three of these contributions (those of Tennyson, Thackeray, and Coventry Patmore) separately, and presented twenty-five copies of each to its respective author." Patmore's contribution to *Victoria Regia* for that year was "The Circles." Mr. Fisk thinks it very peculiar that no mention of this alleged separate pamphlet is to be found in auction records, dealers' catalogues, or bibliographies. He states, "I have searched

through over a hundred catalogues of leading dealers and failed to find any mention whatever of the Patmore Item." He concluded that it was never fabricated, that Mr. Wise included it in his story merely as "an additional bit of embroidery." It may be that he intended to print it, but never got around to the job. The fact that he did not sell Mr. Wrenn a copy is a pretty sure indication that none existed. Neither did Mr. Wise himself have a copy; at least none was entered in the Ashley Catalogue.

Mr. Fisk makes an illuminating analysis of one well-known dealer's listing of forgeries in his catalogues over a period of twenty-five years which suggests forcefully that the forgers had one powerful accessory—perhaps more—in "the trade." He shows, indeed, that dealers' catalogues have more to tell concerning the marketing of the forgeries than the auction records which Messrs. Carter and Pollard used.

Through RAPHAEL KING of London The University of Texas has recently acquired an interesting item from the Walter B. Slater sale: W. C. Bennett's "Locksley Hall," 1887, in which is laid three proofs of the forged titlepage *Idylls of the Hearth*, (*Wise's Letters*, Appendix II), two on ordinary proof paper, and another on the verso of a flyleaf taken from a book of the period.

FANNIE E. RATCHFORD

Centennial of Statehood

Documents

ITEMS FROM THE ARCHIVES COLLECTION, ILLUSTRATING LIFE IN TEXAS A HUNDRED YEARS AGO

III. AN EXCERPT FROM THE MEMOIRS OF FRANCIS RICHARD LUBBOCK.

THE NEW LEGISLATURE met at Austin on February 16, 1846. The old capitol, which had been used only for a church and schoolhouse since February, 1842 (except for the short session of the annexation convention), was now occupied again as a legislative hall. According to Col. John S. Ford, in his paper, the *Austin Democrat*, the capitol was decorated with flags for this occasion. President Jones and Governor-elect Henderson made their appearance, attended by a joint committee of both houses, and escorted by the United States officers of this station. After they were introduced and seated, Judge R. E. B. Baylor led off in an earnest prayer.

President Jones then rose and delivered his valedictory, concluding in these words:

"The Lone Star of Texas, which ten years ago arose amid clouds over fields of carnage, obscurely seen for awhile, has culminated, and following an inscrutable destiny, has passed on and become fixed forever in that glorious constellation which all freemen and lovers of freedom in the world must reverence and adore—the American Union. Blending its rays with its sister States, long may it continue to shine, and may generous heaven smile upon the consummation of the wishes

of the two republics now joined in one. May the union be perpetual, and may it be the means of conferring benefits and blessings upon the people of all the States, is my ardent prayer. The final act in the great drama is now performed. The Republic of Texas is no more!"

During this address intense emotion thrilled every bosom and tears trickled from the eyes of many weather-beaten Texans, who felt that they were being stricken from the roll of nations, and that indeed the Republic of Texas was "no more." Continuing, Colonel Ford says: "Texas is secure in the enjoyment of all that a patriot could wish—her destiny is united to that of the mightiest people on earth. Her watchword must be 'Union' and her progress will be 'Onward.'"

On this event the Washington *Union* of that date thus comments: "We again hail the incorporation of Texas into our Union as one of the most remarkable events of the age. It was accomplished by no violence of the sword; no effusion of blood; no corruption of the people, and by no constraint upon their intentions; but in the best spirit of the age, according to the present principles of free government, by the free consent of the people of the two republics. Well may President Jones have said: 'It was left for the Anglo-American inhabitants of the western continent to furnish a new mode of enlarging the bounds of empire by the more natural tendency and operation of the principles of their free government.'"

•

IV. A LETTER FROM ANSON JONES, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF TEXAS, TO MRS. MARY JONES, FEBRUARY 19, 1846.

Austin Feb. 19th 1846
Thursday

My Dear Wife

The Inauguration of Gen. Henderson came off to-day at 12 O'Clock M. We had pleasant weather, & the ceremonies

passed off very well. I delivered a Valedictory Address somewhat longer than my Inaugural and rather a better piece of composition perhaps. My friends think very well of it. There were a goodly number present, probably about half the number that attended the inauguration last winter, Mr. Weeks the Stenographer took down the Inaugural & the Valedictory Addresses & I will send you copies by this mail. To-night there is to be a ball, which I purpose attending

Dr. Johnson is a candidate for Treasurer but will have opposition perhaps be beaten though I hope not The Legislature will do but little untill next week unless it be to elect the Senators. Houston & Rusk appear to be the only candidates, & the only contest appears to be now which shall get the largest vote.

My health is first rate & I never felt better, or happier than I have to-day — I am indeed relieved from a vast and distressing burthen.

I have written you a few lines nearly every day since I came here but have recieved but one letter from you

If I do not go over to Bexar I will start home in three or four days, but will write & let you know Continue to direct to me at this place. I hope little Charles continues to improve, & that Sam is an excellent boy & learns his book *every day* Kiss the little Sissy for me. I will not close this letter untill after I come from the ball— remember me to Mrs Allen I hope you contrive to make yourselves contented & happy. The Col. is quite well—

Col. Daingerfield arrived from Bexar to-day— He got lost coming over & came near perishing. He was nearly exhausted when he arrived I have not seen him yet.

Friday Morning— I returned home about 3 O,Clock last night, pretty badly "dog bit" — not so badly hurt however as His Excellency the Governor who fell about 2 O,Clock,

Since writing the above the mail has come in and brought me your letter of the 15th the Second I have recieved since I arrived here. I was very glad to hear from you and to learn that Charley continued to improve. I saw Mr. Allen this evening & gave him the Message sent by Mrs. Allen. I thought he looked a little *guilty*, from which his, "long letters" which the Madam sent him meant no letters at all at all [*sic*]

Mr. Woodruff has left I presume as I have not seen him in two or three days. Mr. Farquhar does not contest the election but will return home in a day or two.

We have no news further, I have more than half determined to go over to Bexar on Sunday with Col Hays & some other

Good night, I am *very* sleepy

Thine

Ever

Anson

To

Mrs. Jones

Austin

Feby 23

To,

Mrs. Mary Jones

Barrington

Washington Co.

Recent Books by the University Staff

EXCIDIIUM TROIAE. Edited by E. Bagby Atwood and Virgil K. Whitaker. *Publications of the Mediaeval Academy*, No. 44. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1944. xcii, 84 pp. \$3.50.

The *Excidium Troiae* is a comprehensive, post-classical account of the history of Troy and of Rome, beginning with the wedding of Thetis and Peleus and the episode of the golden apple, whence the Trojan War was engendered, and running through that war itself, the fall of Troy, the wanderings of Aeneas, the Dido episode, Aeneas' activities in Italy, early stories of Rome, and coming to an excessively sudden stop with the merest mention of Caesar Augustus and Tiberius and of the birth of Christ. The Troy story shows no trace of the specifically medieval traditions familiar through Dares, Dictys, Benoit, and others, but derives from distinctly classical, and principally Greek, traditions of the story. Its editors see in it, furthermore, not a potpourri from classical sources, but a distinct version of the Troy story. The Aeneas story is, of course, Virgilian, though with some possibly extra-Virgilian elements, and, in the order of its parts, showing a narrative and chronological rather than an epic order.

The *Excidium Troiae* has come down to us in three manuscripts, one from the end of the ninth, and two from the late thirteenth centuries, and representing, fortunately, two families of the textual tradition. It is written in easy-running colloquial or vulgar Latin, quite different from the figured forms familiar in classical Latin. It is spirited and lively, enriched with many direct speeches. It was composed most

probably in the period between the fourth and sixth centuries of the era, and underwent a thorough re-writing, a stylistic medievalization, at some time before the copying of our oldest text, that in MS LXVI.40, of the Laurenzian Library, Florence. From its style, and particularly from the frequent use of the device of question and answer, and from the manner in which the material is organized, it would seem that the work was intended as a textbook, to drill students in the classical legend.

Mr. Atwood and Mr. Whitaker offer in this book a critical text of the *Excidium Troiae*, with the usual apparatus of variant readings, textual notes, and commentary; they preface the work with a full investigation of the *Excidium Troiae* itself, its relation to other Troy stories, medieval and classical, and to the Virgilian tradition, and they define its literary and linguistic characteristics. There is, of course, a careful scrutiny of the manuscripts. The work was begun by Mr. Atwood, but was continued later in full collaboration with Mr. Whitaker. In general, the textual and linguistic problems fell to Mr. Whitaker, and the literary and historical to Mr. Atwood, particularly the consideration of sources and influences. Of the text itself, the first part, dealing with the Troy story, is largely Mr. Atwood's, the remainder, Mr. Whitaker's. Four plates make possible a personal acquaintance with each of the three manuscripts and with the type of marginal illustration which adorns the Riccardian MS. This study with its careful text and its rich scholarly accoutrements is a particularly welcome and attractive addition to our treasury of the Troy legend.

As No. 44 in the Publications of the Mediaeval Academy, *Excidium Troiae* takes its place in the distinguished series of scholarly works published by the Mediaeval Academy of America in the relatively short time it has been in existence. The range of subjects covered is large, from palaeography to architecture, from government and economics to art and music,—concordances, catalogues, monographs, editions. Willi

Apel's *The Notation of Polyphonic Music, 900-1600*, is now in its third edition; Ralph Adams Cram's *The Cathedral of Palma de Mallorca* is out of print. The Library of The University of Texas is now completing its holdings of this series, by recent acquisition of the volumes which it did not already have. They are now in the process of being catalogued.

R. W.

BETWEEN THE LINES. Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1945. 38 pp., 26 plates. \$8.00.

Between the Lines, a facsimile reproduction of the much talked-of Wise-Forman documents in the library of Mr. Carl H. Pforzheimer, is now off press and ready for distribution by the Rare Book Collections of the University.

The volume is made up of a Foreword by Carl H. Pforzheimer; Introductory Essay by Fannie E. Ratchford; transcripts of the documents with notes; and twenty-six facsimile plates in collotype. Designed by Bruce Rogers and printed by A. Colish on paper carrying the watermark "all rag —P-M Fabriano-Italy", the book is bound in dark blue cloth stamped with The University of Texas seal in gold and is enclosed in a slip case. Four hundred copies were printed for sale.

New Acquisitions

THIS SECTION reviews from time to time the important gifts and purchases received in the Library for the period between issues of the CHRONICLE. It is a selective list, and is not always able to mention every item which may be worthy of attention, but it is intended that it shall always be representative of the more significant type of acquisitions.

LATIN AMERICAN COLLECTION

I

The Spaniards by 1700 had explored from the Mississippi on the east to the Gila River on the west and as far north as Kansas. On the far edges of this vast frontier, they had posted sentinels in the form of presidios. From time to time, the king found it expedient to have someone make a tour of inspection of these far-flung outposts. Don Pedro de Rivera kept a diary of his inspection trip from the time he left Mexico City, on November 21, 1724, until his return there on June 21, 1728. His day by day account, *Diario y Derrotero de lo Caminado, Visto y Observado en el Discurso de la Visita General de Precidios, Situados en las Provincias Ynternas de Nueva España*, . . . , was published in Guatemala in 1736 by Sebastian de Arebalo.

Because only a few copies of this first edition are now extant, Guillermo Porras Muñoz has brought out a new edition, Mexico, 1945, with an introduction, text, and notes. He presented a copy of the reprint to The University of Texas. The rare first edition was acquired with the Joaquín García Icazbalceta Collection in 1937.

Pedro de Rivera spent four months (August 7, 1727, to December 18, 1727) in Texas, then called the kingdom of the New Phillipines. Traversing a thousand leagues, he went as far north as the Red River, and visited San Antonio, La Bahía, and Los Adaes. He was especially impressed by the abundance of plants, animals, and birds in Texas, and made special mention of the night owl, "whose mournful song made all who heard it sad."

II

Among the seven to eight thousand British and Irish soldiers who arrived at Angostura, Venezuela, early in 1818 to fight with Simón Bolívar, was an Irish youth of seventeen. A kinsman of Edmund Burke and of Daniel O'Connell, this young fighting Irishman, Daniel Florencio O'Leary, was born in Cork, Ireland, in 1801. He served as aide-de-camp to Anzoátegui and Sucre, and as aide-de-camp and secretary to Bolívar. He took part in many famous battles: Pantano de Vargas, Boyacá, Bomboná, Pichincha, Ibarra. At the battle of Carabobo, he ordered the British troops to fight till death, and he is said by one biographer to have given Sucre the plan used by Bolívar for the battle of Ayacucho. He became a general in 1829 while under the orders of Sucre.

Frequently he served as a diplomat. In 1824, he was sent by Perú to Chile to solicit the squadron of Admiral Blanco Encalada, which he obtained. In 1826, he was sent by Bolívar on a mission to Colombia, and in 1830, Urdaneta selected O'Leary as minister of Colombia to the United States. Later in 1842-43 and 1876-77, he served Britain as a diplomatic representative. He died in Bogota, on February 24, 1877, and is buried in Caracas, not far from the tomb of Simón Bolívar.

This young Irishman did more for posterity than just fight. He began immediately upon his arrival in America to collect documents and data on the war for independence and the life of Bolívar. He was aided in this enterprise by Sucre, Héres,

José Gabriel Pérez, Espinar, and Pedro Briceño Mendez. O'Leary started his collection with the idea of using the material in his letters to his parents and friends in Ireland. But as time passed and the material accumulated, he began to think of writing the life of Bolívar. After the death of the Liberator, O'Leary retired to Jamaica to write his memoirs. Bolívar's executors gave the Bolívar archives to O'Leary. Soubllette, Salom, Urdaneta, Flores, Montilla, Héres, Lara, Wilson and many others gave him data and documents. Even the Spaniard, General Pablo Morillo, Bolívar's old rival, contributed many documents taken by the Royalists on the fields of battle in Venezuela.

This material collected by O'Leary was published after his death by the government of Venezuela, under the title *Memorias de O'Leary*. The publication, organized by O'Leary's son into a thirty volume set, appeared between 1879 and 1888. The *Memorias de O'Leary* is "the soundest monument erected to date to the glory of Simón Bolívar" and is of inestimable value to the student of early nineteenth century South America.

RARE BOOK COLLECTIONS

Very few of the recent purchases and gifts destined for the Rare Book Collections have yet cleared the accessions and cataloguing rooms. A notable exception is a group of seven books constituting a rich gift from Mr. E. DeGolyer of Dallas. All are in pristine condition, both as to bindings and leaves, and all are in protective cases. Several have autograph material inserted. They are:

Douglas, Norman: *South Wind*. London: Martin Secker [1917]. First Edition, First Issue. Original brown cloth binding in slip case.

Galsworthy, John: *The Man of Property*. London: William Heinemann, 1906. First Edition. First fly leaf carries author's inscription, "Joseph Conrad in friendship from the Author, March 22nd, 1906." Laid in is A.L.s. from Galsworthy to

Frank Harris, Sept. 7, 1928, 2pp., in original envelop. Original green cloth enclosed in slip case.

Thoreau, Henry D.: *Walden; or, Life in the Woods*. Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1854. First Edition. Laid in is an A. L. s. from Charles Sumner to Thoreau, Oct. 31, 1859, 2pp. Original cloth in slip case.

Thoreau, Henry D.: *A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers*. Boston and Cambridge: James Munroe and Company. New York: George P. Putnam. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blackiston. London: John Chapman. 1849. First Edition. Laid in are an A.L.s. from Thoreau to George A. Thatcher, Feb. 16, 1849, 2pp., and an A.L.s. from Margaret Fuller to Thoreau, Oct. 18, 1841, 3pp. Original cloth binding in brown morocco drop case.

Whitman, Walt: *Leaves of Grass*. Brooklyn, New York: 1855. First Edition, First Issue. Laid in is Hamilton W. Mabie's "American Life in Whitman's Poetry," from *The Outlook* of Sept. 5, 1903. Original green cloth in slip case.

Whitman, Walt: *Leaves of Grass*. Brooklyn, New York; 1855. First Edition, Second Issue, with portrait on India paper. Press notices are pasted on end fly leaves. Inside front cover is the bookplate of Oliver Belmont. Original green cloth in slip case.

Whitman, Walt: *Leaves of Grass*. Brooklyn, New York, 1856. Rare Second Edition. Laid in is an A.L.s. from Whitman to C. B. Tillinghast, March 12, 1868. Original green cloth binding.

To these have been added by regular routine:

Camoes, Luiz de: *Lusiadas*. En Madrid, por Ivan Sanchez a costa de Pedro Coello, 1639. 4v.

The Collection of Franklin Imprints. Philadelphia. 1918.

TEXAS COLLECTION

A scarce book in the Texas Collection is *Sketch of Secession Times in Texas and Journal of Travel from Texas through Mexico to California, including a History of the "Box Colony."* By Jas. P. Newcomb, formerly editor of the "Alamo Express,"

San Antonio, Texas. [The Author:] San Francisco, California, August, 1863. 2 p.l., 12 p., 1 l., 33 p. 22.5 cm.

Newcomb came to Texas in 1839 when two years old; he became a newspaper man, started the *Alamo Express* in 1860, and conducted it as a Union paper, opposed to secession. On May 13, 1861, he issued an "extra" in which he criticised the operations of the Knights of the Golden Circle and their followers. That night the plant of the "Alamo Express" was wrecked and the building burned. The editor deemed it prudent to go elsewhere. During his journey through Mexico, he spent the month of November in Durango, where he made the acquaintance of a Dr. ———, who told him the story of the Box Colony of which he had been a member.

"Capt. Michael James Box, of the Texas Rangers" came to Texas at an early day, took part, perhaps, in the War with Mexico, and for ten years thereafter fought Indians by contract, receiving so much per scalp. All this is rather vague, but when he returned to his people in Texas he had many stories to tell. Chief among these was that "about a mountain he had discovered among the mountains of Durango, which he called the 'Red Mountain,' where gold existed in such abundance, that a man could make from twenty-five to a thousand dollars per day, according to his exertion." This story created great excitement in Box's neighborhood, and he agreed to lead a party numbering over three hundred to the site of this golden mountain. "About the first of March, 1861, the main body of the 'Red Mountain' emigrants took up their line of march for Laredo, on the Rio Grande. . . . In Mexico, their hardships began; the roads became rougher, water scarcer," etc. In due time "the colony broke up in confusion."

"Since my arrival in California," continues Newcomb, "I found a work entitled 'Capt. Box's Adventures and Explorations in New and Old Mexico, a record of ten years, etc. by Capt. Michael James Box, of the Texas Rangers,' and dedicated to Ben McCullough. It is evident our hero, is the individ-

ual meant, but that he ever wrote the book, is an absurdity. He may have furnished the items to someone else, in fact, I learned such was the case." The copyright to Box's work was secured in 1859 by Derby & Jackson, publishers, New York. However, all copies examined are dated 1861. If the story of the Box Colony was given correctly by Newcomb, it falls between these dates.

Conditions in 1861 were not favorable for the sale of a "guide to the mineral treasures of Durango, Chihuahua, the Sierra Nevada," etc., the real character of Box's book. It contains no reference to service with the Texas Rangers. A good many copies were left unsold. In 1869 this remnant was copyrighted by James Miller, New York, and again published, with all the errors that marked the original. The differences between the two appear on the title leaf, which is new.

GENERAL

I

The library has just acquired vols. 1-46 of the file of 51 volumes of the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*. This valuable collection contains not only a large number of papers read by members of the Academy at its successive sessions but also a great deal of information pertaining to the history of the distinguished body. Volume I traces this history from 1663, the year of the organization of the Petite Académie (or l'Académie des Inscriptions et Médailles), as it was first called, down to 1716, when it received its present name. It is of interest to note that the great masters of French classical poetry, Jean Racine and Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux, were the sixth and seventh members, respectively, to be named to the Petite Académie (they were already members of the French Academy). Later volumes carry the history of the body through the 18th century, vol. 45 bringing it up to the year 1784. At intervals throughout the collection, there are

membership lists, eulogies of deceased members, and elaborate indexes.

The papers read by the learned Academicians are concerned with four main fields of study: ancient history, classical philology and literature, inscriptions (monuments, medallions, etc.), and mediaeval French history and literature. Noteworthy is a series of papers in vol. 15 by Louis Racine, son of the celebrated tragedian, on the nature of poetry, and another, scattered through several volumes, by the mediaevalist La Curne de Ste.-Palaye, on the institution of knighthood and on comparative Romance linguistics of the 12th and 13th centuries. Inasmuch as the Church was one of the chief promoters of learning in the pre-Revolutionary period, we are not surprised to find a large number of ecclesiastics among the writers of the erudite papers. The collection as a whole is a rich mine of source materials for scholars in a wide variety of fields of humanistic research.

II

Dr. Lionello Venturi, respected critic of Italian art, in the course of several visits to the United States, became aware of the many fine examples of Italian painting in American art collections not included in the standard reference works compiled in Europe. In 1931 he published *Pitture Italiane in America* which did much to dispel European prejudices regarding American art collections. The volume was so enthusiastically received that it was inevitably followed by an enlarged English language edition, *Italian Painting in America* (Milano, 1933). The Library has recently added this edition to its collection of visual materials on painting. This three volume work, in addition to affording a panoramic view of Italian painting, should serve to stimulate study in a field previously avoided because of the feeling of being too far removed from the source material in Italian art.

III

Selected *Bulletins* and *Memoirs* of the Institut d' Egypte, Cairo, consisting for the most part of paleontologic and strata-graphic studies, have been purchased by the Library. These publications give important information relative to the geology of an important segment of the Mediterranean terrain. Each volume is one more chapter in the otherwise incomplete history of the earth. Two of the world's richest oil regions are the lands contiguous to the Gulf of Mexico and the marginal tracts of the eastern Mediterranean Sea. Petroleum prospecting in these regions has been extensive, but the dwindling reserves of the United States make a continued and more vigorous search in the already proven terrains an economic necessity. The proximity of The University of Texas to the Gulf Coastal Plain is good cause for a study and comparison of another zone which has the appearance of being so very similar structurally. Staff members of both the Bureau of Economic Geology and the Department of Geology have found the Egyptian studies of invaluable aid in making comparative studies of widely separated faunas.

•

THE LIBRARY CHRONICLE is edited by Joseph Jones, Department of English, and published by the Library of The University of Texas, Austin 12, Alexander Moffit, Librarian.





